

A  
Course of Divinity:

OR, AN

INTRODUCTION

To the Knowledge of the True

Catholick Religion;

Especially as Professed by the

CHURCH

OF

ENGLAND:

In two Parts;

The one containing, *The Doctrine of Faith*;  
The other, *The Form of Worship*.

By MATTHEW SCRIVENER.

L O N D O N,

Printed by *Tho. Roycroft* for *Robert Clavil* in *Little*  
*Brittain*. MDCLXXIV. 1674



THE UNIVERSITY

OF THE STATE

OF NEW YORK

IN SENATE

January 10, 1880

REPORT

OF THE

COMMISSIONERS

OF THE LAND OFFICE

IN RESPONSE TO A

RESOLUTION PASSED

AT THE SENATE

OF JANUARY 10, 1879

AND

APPROVED

AT THE SENATE

OF JANUARY 10, 1880



# THE ENTRANCE.



OR the better conceiving and judging of this ensuing Treatise, I have held it necessary, Christian Reader, to premise and propound to thy consideration these two things principally : viz. The Occasions me thereunto moving, and the manner of proceeding in it.

One Occasion given me was the multitude and variety of the like Books set forth by other Churches, whereby not only the persons under them, were trained up in the Knowledge and Faith professed there, but the minds of many of our Church were prepossessed, and their manners swayed by such Doctrines, which seemed to me as foreign in nature, as place, to those of our Church, and the Ancient.

I could have here given the Reader the names of above forty Treatises of this nature, many of which have been translated into the English Tongue, to the corrupting of weaker judgments. And not so much as the Christians of New-England have been wanting to the Interest of their Religion, so far as to omit so advantageous a Work, but by John Norton Teacher (as he calls himself) of the Church at Ipswich in New-England, have collected certain Principal Heads of Divinity into a Body, called The Orthodox Evangelist.

## The Entrance.

*And as the great number of forreign Books have incited me, so the Paucity of the like, in, and from our Church, hath no less emboldened me to undertake this. I am prevented by Industrious Mr. Baxter, in giving any account of such who have made attempts this way, and what hath been done by them without bringing their design to desired issue: Only that excellently Learned Person Mr. Thorn-dyck (passed over by him) in his declining years, hath given greater demonstrations of his zeal and learning in behalf of the English Church, than any extant before him, in one continued Body; purposing a Review in the Latin Tongue, wherein he intended to have more clearly expressed his meaning in some things, of which it might be said, as of St. Pauls writings, they were hard to be understood: and he himself saw to be wrested to evil ends and senses; but his declining body and years would not suffer him to accomplish so good a Work.*

*What Mr. Baxter himself hath performed in his late large Volume, I shall not give my censure: but how well he is qualified for such a Work, I may presume to give the Reader in the words of a great admirer of him. Baxter (saith he) is of all men least addicted to any resolute opinions, being one that favoureth not more the Presbyterians than the Independents; neither is he sharp against the Episcopal Party, but between them, and doubtful what side to take, except in the cause of God, and holiness of Life. The greatest part of which Character is but too true: being as much with me, as if he had said, He were of no Religion at all. For however Beza and Cartwrights opinions of a certain and definite Discipline Essentially requisite to a Church, as a Church is to Christian Religion, be by Puritans laid aside for the present: and like embers buried up in the Ash-heap till they shall rise again next day, and kindle a new fire; and now nothing but Get Christ, Purity of Ordinances, is notorious amongst them, to the Vulgar; yet when people are deceived by that, they call Pure and Powerful Preaching of Christ into new Societies of their own Manufacture; then presently doth most apparent Reason and inevitable Necessity constrain them to indent, and impose new Covenants and Bonds to conserve them in their new Fraternities, contrary altogether to that General Liberty before propounded and promised them. No more than*

*Est Baxterus  
certis & defi-  
nitis sententiis  
minimè omni-  
um hominum  
addictus, ut qui  
non plus faveat  
Presbyterianis  
quam Indepen-  
dentibus, nec  
est infensus  
Hierarchicis,  
sed medius du-  
binsque parti-  
bus, nisi in cau-  
sa Dei & san-  
ctitatis vitæ.  
Ludovicus  
Molinæus  
Patroni p. 12.*



## The Entrance.

than doth the charm of *Christian Liberty* sound in their ears. No more of the free use of *Indifferent things*, so contrary to the *Decrees and Practise of a Church*, but then come into credit again such sayings as these ; There must be Order : There must be Government : There must be unity in the Church : dealing herein with poor simple Christians, as men do with their horse they would take up, carrying in one hand provender, which they show him, and make a great noise with, and behind them in the other hand, a bridle to hold him fast to them, and ride him as they please.

And if Mr. Baxter be of no regulated determinate Society or Church, adheres to no particular Communion, submits to no Government, nor Governours in special, but to all, or any, as it should seem, he must bear it as well as he can, when he bears himself (not out of passion or envie at his new and singular device of going to heaven, but justice and reason) censur'd for a man of no Religion at all, or if any, of his own making : which teaches him to persevere in that fond and haughty design he once had, when he took upon him to top his Brethren of the Ministry in the Western Parts, and to frame Grounds and Aphorisms for both Civil and Ecclesiastical Politie of his own ; with as little judgment and humility as safety to the Church and State: as if he had aim'd at nothing so much, as to be according to foreign Phrase and Presidents, an Extraordinary Pastor ; without any Original or Rule, but from himself : but failing of this, he now thinks it best to become an Extraordinary Sheep ; of all, and no fold ; writing Books as uncertain and contrary, as himself, on all sides and for all Palates : as if he had found out the Universal Character for Religions, like to that of Languages ; in which all men doing as he wou'd have them, shou'd agree in going to Heaven. And now all that lately and most officious and serviceable method of mounting our selves, and crushing and trampling on the necks of others, and them our Governours, by most unjust and cruel acts, most false and bitter language, must be laid aside, and thrown overboard, as the Turks did their Cemeters, when they lost the day at the battle of Lepanto, not because they liked them not, but because they could do them no more service ; and least they should come into the Christians hands, and be used against them. So indeed Sectaries now-a-dayes call for modesty and moderation on all hands, casting away that unchristian

a 2

language

## The Entrance.

language which stood them in so much stead against them they resolved to destroy, not without horrible Success.

And yet we see, while they call so charitably for moderation, and would have no revilings of them that differ in opinions only; their churlish nature and virulent tongues, cannot forget their wonted strains of dishonesty and extream spite and railings: witneß one for all, the foresaid Ludovicus Molinæus; who, as civilly and reverently as he carries himself towards Mr. Baxter (for none of his vertues we may be sure) as exorbitantly in the old Puritans language, and on their Grounds, flies in the face of the Greatest and Best of the Rulers of the Church and State too: who have at any time resolutely opposed the designs and Schismaical devices of such unchristian Reformers as himself: only I must confess he is favourable to his late Sacred Majesty, whose invincible Piety and unparallel'd innocency of Life, and Ignominious, yet Glorious Death, hath not only struck Sectaries dumb, who once opened so loudly and perniciously against him, but extorted cold commendations from them: not much unlike that approbation given by that Parricide Antonius the Emperor, who when he understood how the people of Rome magnified, and even deified his virtuous Brother Geta, whom he had wickedly murdered, said, Sit Divus modò non sit vivus; (i.e.) Let him be Divine so he be not living. But whom doth he, or his Fellows (occasion serving) spare? Hath he not raked the stinking Canal of all old lyes and feigned rumors invented to imbroyl the Church in Schism, and Kingdome in Sedition and Bloud, and indeavoured to put new life into them, and Authentize them to other Countries as well as ours?

Speech Delivered in the  
Star Chamber  
p. 2.

It was soberly and seasonably said by that excellent Arch-bishop (whom he would traduce in basest manner, were not his merits above the Calumnies of such wretched Fellows) in his Speech in the Star-chamber, at the Charge of Prin, Burton, and Bastwick, viz. There were times when Persecutions were great in the Church, even to exceed Barbarity it self: Did any Martyr or Confessor in these times Libel their Governors? Surely no; not one of them to my best remembrance: yet these complain of Persecution without all shew of cause; and in the mean time, libel and rail without all measure: so little a kin are they to those who suffer for Christ, or the least part of Christian Religion. This witneß is most true of these Cretians. And

## The Entrance.

*And it is my great glory, not only to be named among such eminent persons as lately, but at present are living in our Church, whom this Molinæus traduceth. And why so? because of my rude usage of Mr. Daillee, whom I spit on (if any will believe him) rather then dispute against: That I spare not the memory of Diodate: That I am no fairer to Mr. Bochartus. And why doth he forget my railing too against his Brethren the Puritans? This he might better say. But neither he nor any man else can say that I imitate Puritans, in railing against my Betters or Governors: that's their peculiar and inseparable virtue; and hath been from the first founding of the Discipline by Penrie, Whittingham, Goodman, and Cartwright, with others, to the confounding of the Church, so far as lay in their power. I ever was not only an approver, but an admirer of the personal Gifts of Calvin and Beza, of Monsieur Daillee, and Monsieur Bochart, &c. but I owe them no more respect in the cause of Religion than they do me, or any man else of our Church: but I profess I owe more Reverence to the least of the Bishops and Fathers of the Church, whom Puritans have so basely treated, then to the greatest of them; and so do Sectaries too, as ill as they are galled to bear of it.*

Lud. Molin.  
Antidure.  
Epist. p. 54.

*But what, do I speak so irreverently (after all) against Mr. Daillee? Not a word hath this Zelote found in my whole Book against him, nor in that Action against our Schismatics, whom I confess to have severely treated, in that I give them their own; some mens dealings being so foul (as theirs have been) that the very bare recitation of them is lookt on as railing, though never so faithfully done. If any of them, or their friends, can tell me wherein I have done them wrong, in misreporting their Facts, I do here assure them I will make them all the satisfaction I am able, in retracting and acknowledging my Error, and that as publickly as I have injured them, with the next opportunity. Cyprian, Optatus, Hierom, Austin, Nazianzen, and Chrysostom (as holy and sober persons as they were in their Generations) made no great scruple to paint Schismatics out in their Colors, with language which cuts where it goes: and I am sure these upon no better grounds than they have, or can possibly offer, of departing from, and dividing our Church, are no better. Nay, in this hath the Puritan Sectary transcended all Hereticks and Schismatics that ever*



## The Entrance

went before them. For though divers Factions were raised and fomented to a great height in the Church of God of old, and Altar was erected against Altar, and Chair against Chair (i. e.) Worship against Worship, and Governor against Governor of the Church; yet do we find none, through all the Histories of the Church, that ever became so presumptuous and desperate, as to endeavour the total subversion of the Government of the Church in it self, and to set up another in the room of it, quite of another nature, which we read not that Aerius himself ever attempted, though he preached up the equality of Bishops and Presbyters. And so far am I from such a spirit of meekness (I confess) that I shall never smooth them, or their cause over so civilly, as to imply the contrary, until they bethink themselves without their customary frauds and dissimulations, of their duties, and return to the Peace and Unitie of the Church; which I shall not cease to pray for.

But one of the most material things charged on me is, That I liked Dailees Book the worse because it pleased the Puritans so much: which (says my Accuser) is to be of the spirit of Maldonate the Jesuite. But he is mistaken. For Maldonate indeed rejected a sense of Scripture which otherwise he approved, because it was Calvins. If I disliked Dailees opinions only because they were Dailees, or our Puritans, he had been somewhat near the matter; but no such thing hath fallen from me. I disliked indeed his Book, because it so far pleased the Puritans, that they were thereby notably confirmed in their obstinate Opinions against the Authority of the Ancient, and our Present Church. Here were evil effects also to be disliked.

Next let us hear how I abuse Diodate of Geneva, in that I rehearse this saying of him against King Charles the first: viz. That Christ in the Gospel commands us to forgive our enemies, but not our friends. This he calls Crassum mendacium, A gross lye in me; whereas the lye (if there be any) must necessarily be in himself, or his brother Puritan, Cook the Solicitor, against King Charles the first, at his Sentence in that monstrous Court. For I no where say of my self, that Diodate said those words, but I said that Cook reports them as heard from Diodates own mouth: and I there give him  
the

## The Entrance.

the very Page where those words are to be found: and this simple Quarreller and Vindicator of Puritans, hath no other way to evade this, then by a bold and senseless denial of the thing so apparent.

Now to that excellently learned person Bochartus, what is it I say against him, but that he would needs be meddling where it concerns him not; as the too common practise hath constantly been both of French and Dutch Divines? What have they to do to interpose so often and uncharitably in behalf of Puritans as they have? Is it not sufficient that they are not disquieted by us in their singularities and inconformities to the perpetual constitution and orders of Christs Universal Church, but they must needs seek all occasions pragmatically to animate Sectaries, to give them counsel and assistance, to give them Communicatory Letters, in the height of their Seditions and Schisms, to write Apologies and Vindications for them, as Bochartus hath? In which, besides this, I think he was in an error, to suppose that that great Truth he defends, of Subjects not to take up Arms against their Sovereign, can be made good from the Cabbalistical and Talmudical sayings of the Rabbies, upon which that Thesis is chiefly built, and may be as easily pull'd down by rejecting such Ornaments, rather then Arguments of Speech. And this is all he objects against me in that bold Work of his, saving several reproachful tearms, which I will not trouble any body with: Only concerning the Canina facundia, (i. e.) Dogged Eloquence he taxeth me with, I may tell him, I am not fit to be his, or his Brethrens Scholar in such Speeches; And yet as \* Rusticus Diaconus hath it against the Acephali or headless Schismaticks in his days; It's very absurd for us to be found more cool for the Truth, when we write against such as vehemently assert the contrary. And concerning the barbarousness and unevenness of my stile, though I want not matter of defense from several heads, I shall pass them over, and also his most polite and elegant stile, for which he praises himself so worthily and wisely; and only refer the Reader to that one instance which he may find Page 2 and 3 of his Patronus against Monsieur Durell: where this great and vain-glorious Latinist, while he magnifies his singular Talent of Elegance in the Latin Tongue, offends in his tedious and ill-joynted Period against the Rules of Rhetorick, and in worse concordance against the common Rules of Grammar: So unluckie is this man, and that in more ways then I will object to him.

\* *Tempus est contra ardentem perversam assentes, nos pro veritate frigidiores inveniri.* Rustic. Disc. Advert. Acephal.

*Nisi me mea fallat opinio, affirmare auiam quantum familiaris congressus gratia & lepore vincor à Durello, tantum illum à me superari orationis scripte nitore & utilitate: cum ejus scriptio sua prolixitate & ariditate pariat fastidium & tedium lectoris, haud dubium mea etiam ad aperturam libri detinebit cum amena & fructifera voluptate, capiente desiderio ulteriora legendi, nullis officiis, Strophis, paralogismis, & imprimis diverticulis cum à proposito, tum à ratione remota, & cardine litte questionibusque inter Hierarchicos & Puritanos vertitur determinatus & compulsum ad alijciendas charitas, ut in lectione vindictarum Durellianarum.* Lud. Molin. ante Durel. Patroni. p. 23.

## The Entrance.

*And now I must touch a farther occasion of my present undertaking; and that was the many errors vented by dissenting persons in our Church, with which our Adversaries commonly revild us; as shall be seen by and by: in the meantime, least any should suppose I go out of the common road of forreign Reformers, so much trod by many Dissenters amongst us, because I was not well skill'd in Calvins, Bezas, and Urbins Works, I must tell them, they were the Authors first of all recommended unto me, and read by me more then those of our own Church. And because I knew well of what great account, as well abroad, as at home, Mr. Perkins his works were, I would be no stranger in them: but finding in them a servile and credulous spirit, so far addicted to such Modern Divines, that scarce any thing so new, harsh, or inconsistent with the judgment of Antiquity fell from them, but Perkins presently took it up for Scripture and Catholick Doctrine, and transcribed the same into his Works: I have here collected in brief what I observed as Heterodox in his Works, apt to corrupt young and injudicious Readers. But here I shall say nothing of his known monstrous sense of Gods Decrees and Predestination, but what a Learned Person, his great friend and defender hath said before me, Bishop \*Abbot: Perkins (saith he) otherwise a very learned and godly man, in describing Divine Predestination, which, contrary to our, and the Ancient Church, he hath determined to be decreed without the fall of Adam, hath committed no small Error.*

**1.** *The first I observe is his sense of Justification by Faith thus expressed: The Gospel promiseth life to him that doth nothing in the cause of his Salvation, but only believeth in Christ: and promiseth Salvation to him that believeth, yet not for his Faith, nor for any Works, but for the Merits of Christ. The Law then requires doing unto Salvation, and the Gospel believing, and nothing else. Both ends of this sentence are utterly false and scandalous to Christianity it self; and most of all, as he there explains himself, thus; Believing and doing are opposed in the Article of Justification, in our good conversation they agree: Faith goeth before, and Doing follows; but in the work of our Justification they are as fire and water.*

*To the same effect he speaketh afterward: All which we have refuted,*

Perkinsus qui  
in Angliâ Pra-  
dica & Mysti-  
ca Theologiae  
vexillum exu-  
lit, & cujus  
serpentes &  
concomitus,  
sensuente per-  
ni, tot exuvia  
scripta practi-  
ca & tot effi-  
caces conciones  
practicae in An-  
glia, & deinde  
passim Belgio  
nostro atque ab  
aliis nationibus  
irrisae. Vor-  
tius Biblioth.  
l. 2 c. 3.

\* Abbot in  
Thompson  
Diatrib. c. 1.  
Perkinsus  
vir aliquem  
eruditus & pi-  
us, in descripti-  
one divinae  
Praedestinationis,  
quam ille  
contra nostram,  
contra veteris  
Ecclesiae fidem  
citra lapsum  
Adami absolute  
decretam con-  
stituit, errorem  
non levem er-  
ravit.  
Perkins on  
Gal. 3. v. 12.

Non apprehendi  
potest quod pro-  
mittitur, nisi  
custoditum fu-  
erit quod jubetur.  
Leo M.  
Ser. 9. ad Je-  
jun. 7. Mensis.  
V. 18.



## The Entrance.

*futed, shewing that in no place of Scripture, are the works of Faith opposed to Faith in Christ, in any consideration; but only the works of the Law, as opposite to, or not done in Christ, nor in Faith.*

2. *Secondly, he saith, A third benefit to them that believe in Christ is, That they have liberty to live and serve God without fear of damnation, or any other evil.*

Id. ib. cap. 3.  
p. 320.

3. *Thirdly, God never gave to any man power to effect a Miracle, either mediately or immediately. The Gift was Faith of Miracles. The Faith was grounded upon the Revelation, and the Revelation was that God would work such and such a Miracle when they prayed, commanded, or imposed hands. This was invented still to drown all Christian Gifts and Graces in Faith.*

Chap. 3. & 5.

4. *Fourthly, The two Testaments, the Law and the Gospel, are two in nature, substance, and kind. This I know is Calvins Doctrine, and his Followers; but not the Fathers, nor theirs, who follow them: For thus writeth Lactantius, The Jews use the Old Testament, we the New; but yet they are not diverse, because the New is the fulfilling of the Old, and Christ is the same Testator in both. And Chrysostom thus, 'Εἰ τῷ χρόνῳ διήσθη, ἀλλὰ τῷ σκοπῷ οὐκ ἤντη. If the New and old Testaments be divided as to time, yet they are united as to their scope. And before both these, Irenæus speaketh thus, The Precepts of perfect life are the same in both Testaments: and being the same, declare the same God who urged particular Precepts agreeing with each, but the most eminent and chief, without which we cannot be saved, are the same in both. And after all these, and many more, Austin in sundry places affirmeth the same thing, as doth our Church \*. It matters therefore not much with me, that Voetius wou'd rather disgrace this opinion, then disprove it by saying, The Socinians, and such as are much of the same mind with them, as the Remonstrants and Papists, so hold: but his Party deny it absolutely.*

Id. ib. c. 1.  
p. 347.

*Judei veteri utuntur, nos novo, sed tamen diversa non sunt, quia novum veteris adimpletio est: Et in utroque Idem Testator Christus est.*  
Lactant. l. 4.  
Instit. c. 20.  
Chrysost. Tom. 7. Ser. 1. p. 16.  
Iren. l. 4. c. 26. dem.  
Præceptum continentibus Lex est, amantibus gratia. Aug. ad Simpl. l. 1. qu. 1.  
\* Articles of Church of Eng. art. 7.  
Voet. Sele. 8. Disp. part. 4. de lege & Evang. q. æst. 4.

*Fifthly, St. James cap. 2. v. 26. understands a pretended Faith or the profession of Faith, as appears v. 14, 18. This doth not appear any more than it appears that such is that Faith whereby they hold they are justified. Why have they, why can they not to this very day assign and describe plainly either that special Act, or that special Pro-*

## The Entrance.

position or Article of Faith whereby they are justified without any works of Faith in Co-ordination to Faith or other Graces.

Ib. pag. 277.  
Also on the  
Creed. p. 215.

*Sixthly*, There is no offence to say, He [*Christ*] suffered the pains of Hell so far forth, as this suffering might consist with the purity of his Manhood, and with the truth of his personal union. *This is right Calvin.*

Id. Cases of  
Conscience.  
l. 2, c. 8.

*Seventhly*, The Sacraments administered by the Second sort (i.e.) (*Private Persons*) having no authority ordinary is a mere nullity. *If this be true, what becomes of the Acts of divers eminent Reformers, in case it be proved they never had any Ordinary Authority, or Ordination? Why do not they rebaptize those who are baptized by Independents, whom they must confess to have no Ordinary Authority, or Ordination, or have renounced it, as some of them have professed to my self?*

Ib. p. 74.

*Eighthly*, Baptism is appointed of God to be no more but a seal annexed unto, and depending upon the Covenant. *Afterwards he*

In Gal. p. 235.

*repeats the same in a far worse manner: As also on the Galatians.*

Perkins  
Cases of Conf.  
p. 109, 110.

*Ninthly*, If any man binds himself by Oath to live in single life without marriage, and after finds that God hath not given him the gift of Continence, in this case his Oath becomes impossible to be kept: and therefore being reversed by God, and becoming unlawful, it may be broken without impiety. *This is a device to excuse we know whom, principally; and leaves men at liberty to break such lawful vows, under pretence that God hath denied his sufficient Grace to keep them; and they are impossible to be kept: who shall determine when God denies that Gift? Every man that is tempted to break his Vow?*

*Tenthly*, The Vow of Regular obedience is against the word of God, 1 Cor. 7. 7. ye are bought with a price, be not the servants of men. *And why is this so, rather then for subjects to vow obedience to their Governors, and children to their Parents? If you say, because God commandeth the latter, and not the former; you imply that God could command contrary things; for this is to be subject to man as well as that. St. Paul is quite mistaken by such Scholastics as thus interpret him.*

Ib. p. 1.  
Καὶ ὁ ὁ  
ἐξ ὧν  
ὡς ἐπ' ἐαυτοῦ  
καὶ. Nyssen.  
Catech. O.  
rat c 7.

*Eleventhly*, Whatsoever wanteth conformity to the Law of God is sin, whether it be with consent of will or no. *This supposes what is false, viz. that any thing can be morally evil, the will altogether dissenting both as to cause in general, and effect.*

## The Entrance.

12. Zipporah's act of circumcising her child was a sin of Toleration. *So is murder divers times : and is this no other ?* 1b. p. 8.

13. Second grace is nothing else but the continuance of the first grace. *This I wonder at as much as any thing in him, who advances Grace so highly. It is contrary to Austin in many places, as (to name no more) in his Epistle to Boniface, in these words distinguishing a three-fold grace : For what is more comfortable to the weak, then grace, whereby they are healed; or to the sloathful, then grace, whereby they are quickned ; or to the willing, then grace, whereby they are helped ?* *Quid enim debet esse iucundus vel infirmis, gratia quæ sanantur, vel pigris, gratia quæ excitantur, vel volentibus, gratia quæ adiuvantur. Aug. in Bonifacio Epist. 106. Cases of Conscience, p. 66.*

14. Christ knew not that the fig-tree had no figs on it till he came to it. *He might better have said, he knows not the day of judgment till it comes. The Fathers Answer to the Arrians objecting this, will serve for both.*

15. The fourth Commandment is Moral, and hath nothing Ceremonial in it. 1b. l. 2. c. 14.

16. In regard of Conscience, Holiness, and Religion, all places are equal and alike in the New Testament, since the coming of Christ. The House, or Field, is as holy as the Church. And if we pray in either of them, our prayer is as acceptable to God, as that which is made in the Church. *The contrary will appear afterward.* 1b. p. 78.

17. All virtues that are not joyn'd with renovation and change of Affection, are no better then sins. This point the Philosophers never knew. *No, I warrant them. For had they, they should have known more then any good Christian, as it is thus crudely delivered. Austin vulgarly quoted, favors it not.* 1b. p. 335. Item Gal. 1. & 5.

18. Infidels do steal and usurp the blessings of God, to which they have no just title, themselves being out of Christ. *This is gross enough, and dangerous.* P. 14<sup>o</sup>.

19. In the Article of our Creed, Sitting at the right hand of God, signifieth the inferiority of the Mediator in respect of the Father. *This wants a lusty grain of Salt.* P. 174.

20. The vow of single Life is a snare, or as the noose in the halter, to strangle the Soul. On Gal. 1. v. 7.

21. The third [Succession] is of Doctrine alone : and thus our Ministers succeed the Apostles, and this is sufficient. *It is sufficient for the Peoples, not Gods Ministers.*



## The Entrance.

Id. Gal. p. 196,  
197.

22. If in *Turkie*, or *America*, or elsewhere the Gospel should be received by the counsel and perswasion of private persons, they shall not need to send into *Europe* for Consecrated Ministers, but they have power to choose their own Ministers from within themselves : Because where God giveth the word , he giveth the power also.

Id. Gal. l. i. v. 22.

23. The Child of God falling into persecution and denying Christ----- is not guilty to condemnation : because, &c.

24. If, as *Eusebius* saith in his Chronicle, *Peter* sate Bishop of *Rome* twenty five years, then *Peter* lived in breach of the expresse commandment of God for so long time , because the Jews were his special charge. *Absurd and untrue.*

P. 235.

25. We are born Christians, if our Parents believe, and not made so in Baptism.

P. 242.

26. The Sacraments are said to apply Christ, in that they serve to confirm Faith, whose office it is to apply, &c.

P. 381.

27. All the works of Regenerate men are sinful, and in the rigor of justice deserve damnation. *Well therefore may he say this of unregenerate men : but neither is it true so far of one or other, but the not doing of such good works is much more damnable: It is true properly that they do not of themselves save, but not so that they damn.*

Id. Papiſt can-  
not go beyond  
a reprobate.  
p. 396.

28. There be three parts of Penance, Contrition of heart, Confession of the mouth, Satisfaction in the deed : All these three *Judas* performed.

Ibid.

29. As long as a man hath his Conscience to accuse him of sin before God, he is in a state of Damnation, as *St. John* saith 1 *Ep. 2. 10. St. John saith not so.*

Ib. p. 397.  
Advertisement  
to the Roman  
Church. p. 622.  
Vol. 1.

30. The Church of *Rome* teacheth that Original Sin is done away in Baptism. *This is called a damnable Error : as if only the Ch. of Rome held so, and it were not unanimously held by the Fathers.*

31. That we believe the Catholick Church , it follows that the Catholick Church is invisible.

Reform. Ca-  
tholick. p. 615.

32. We esteem of Repentance only as a fruit of Faith, and the effect or efficacy of it, is to testify the Remission of our sins, and our reconciliation before God.

Ib. p. 613, 614.

33. There is a twofold conversion , Passive and Active : Passive is an Action of God, whereby he converteth man, being yet unconverted.

*These*

## The Entrance.

*These are the Heterodox Dogmes which Mr. Perkins suckt in from Calvins Divinity, upon whose sleeve he seem'd to have pin'd his faith; notwithstanding Scripture is so vehemently pretended, which will warrant none of them. And by these credulously assented to, and preached contrary to the mind of our Church, by vulgar and lazie Divines, who would take no care or pains to look into the Scriptures, or the Doctrine of the Ancient Church, but through such mens Spectacles, have diversity of opinions been bred in the common peoples mind, to their dislike of their Governours, and at last such a rupture as hath wasted and almost consumed us.*

*But here I am to give the curious Reader notice, least I may seem to mis-report any thing quoted out of Mr. Perkins, according to the pages, that upon examining them, and comparing them on this occasion, I find what I took no notice of at first reading of his Works, that I followed two several Editions of his Works in Folio: the one of the year 1626, and the other of the year 1631, which not having by me I could not rectifie, but doubt not but they are to be found in one of them.*

*And now because I perceive the Papists triumph when they can find such blemishes in our Church, and charge it with all these, and such like, which they may find among dissenters, I shall set down likewise their principal accusations, as I find them collected and summ'd up by Fitz-Simons: and the rather because he professes to have taken them out of a much more wise and learned Adversary to us then himself, Alanus Copus, otherwise called Nicolas Harpsfield; and they are these following:*

1. *The first Error he layes to our charge, is that we hold There are only two Sacraments. This we stand to, as commonly explained by our Church.*

2. *Infants belong to the people of God before they are Baptized. This indeed is the opinion of Sectaries, which Perkins before cited might have led them into; but not of our Church, nor the Ancient Church; as may appear most evidently from the testimony of* † *Theodoret, who in the behalf of the Catholick Church, absolutely disowns unbaptized persons as Sons of God, though they believed and embraced the Catholick Doctrine; telling us that the Church would by no means suffer such to say the Lords Prayer: accounting it an hor-*

Henricus  
Fitzsimon  
Britannoma-  
chia minist. l.  
2 c. 3.

† Τάυτην τὴν  
πεπισχυλὴν ἡ  
τὴν ἀμνήτως  
ἀλλὰ τὸς μυ-  
σαρῶμενος  
διδασκομεν.  
Οὐδὲν γὰρ  
τῶν ἀμνήτων  
λίγην τοῦ μα-  
πάτερ ἡμῶν ὁ  
ἐν τοῖς ἑσ-  
ποῖς ὡς τὴ  
ἐξῆς.  
Theod. Ha-  
ret. Fab. l. 5. c.  
28.

d

rrible

## The Entrance.

rible thing for any to call God Father before he was baptized, speaking thus: This Prayer we teach not such who are not initiated, but such as are partakers of that Mystery: For none that are not initiated into that Mystery, dares say, Our Father which art in Heaven, &c. not having received that Grace of Adoption.

Church Cate-  
chisin.

3. The true Body of Christ is not in the Eucharist, nor any thing but the substance of Bread. *Sure this fierce Accuser forgets himself. Do we not also hold the substance of Wine remains in the Eucharist, as well as that of bread? Nay, do we not profess \* Christs Body and Bloud are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful in the Lords Supper? And can they there be received, unless they be there? but the art of such rampant, ignorant, and malicious Factors for the Roman Church, ever consisted principally in wilful bungling, and by false stating of the differences between us and them, to beguile the weak and unwary.*

4. That the Communion under both kinds is necessary: *It is as necessary under both, as under one. The contrary is the Sacrilegious Error of the Romanists.*

5. A Priest may not communicate alone. *Another grievous Error, that we cannot indure, Non-sense, nor to see Christs institution basted by such a ridiculous Communion unknown to Antiquity.*

6. It is unlawful to reserve or elevate the Eucharist. *Not simply, as the Ancient Church did, only to signifie how Christ was lifted up on the Cross: but as practised in the Roman Church, to the intent direct and divine Worship be given it.*

7. Wicked men eat not the Body of Christ. *Sure enough, in a proper sense, not denominatively only, as the consecrated Elements are called the Body of Christ, very often and currently.*

8. That they who communicate not, are to be put out of the Church. *This is such an Error as the Ancient Church was guilty of as well as we, as your own Vicecomes sheweth at large.*

Vicecomes  
Vol. 3. l. 1. c.  
18.

9. The Keys of the Church consist only in opening the Word of God. *No such thing is held by us.*

10. Private Confession is to be taken away. *Not so much as Sectaries say this absolutely.*

Artic. 2c.

11. The Ceremonies of the Church are to be abrogated. *Simply and falsly said, and directly contrary to the Articles of our Church.*

12. Prayers



## The Entrance.

12. Prayers in the Latin Tongue are barbarous, and against *St. Pauls* Precept. *Very true: where they are at first so instituted, and understood by very few or none, and so are they in the English Tongue, or any other.*

13. No man can fulfill the Law. *This is true, or false, as it may be taken.*

14. More Masses then one cannot be said in one day in one Church. *Here our Accuser saith he knows not what: For neither doth our Church inhibit more then once to officiate Liturgically; neither did the Ancient Church practise, if permit it, for above four hundred years after Christ: as appears from Dioscorus Bishop of Alexandria, consulting with Leo the first, Bishop of Rome, what he should do, when Christians were so numerous, that they could not all be received into the Church, at once? who answered: In such cases he might safely reiterate the office. And the Council of Antifiodorum or Auxere held about the Year 578, decreed that but one Mass should be said upon one Altar in one day: which is as much observed by the Church of Rome now-a-days, as other Canons of Councils which lye in their way, thrown out. And where in the Ancient Church do you read of above one Altar in one Church?*

Leo 1 Epist.  
72, or as some  
So.  
See also Gre-  
cian confect.  
Dist. c. 51.

15. Unity is no Note of the Church. *Discords and Divisions are certain signs of Errors; but Unity is no certain sign of Truth; nor so much as of a Church, how then can it be of a true Church?*

16. Universal Councils may be repeal'd by Particular. *This is nothing: he might have said by particular persons, as the Popes: who may, according to that Church, null Acts of Councils Oecumenical. But we only hold that in things mutable, according to the condition of Time, Place, and other Circumstances, rendring some Decrees prejudicial to some Churches, contrary to the intention of the first Ordainers of them, a Provincial Church may make alterations.*

See Petrus  
Gregorius  
Syntagm. l. 15.  
c 3.

Article 34.

17. The Church may erre in Faith. *And what of that? meaning any one Individual single Church; as the Roman hath, according to our Articles.*

18. The Precepts of the Church concerning set Fasts are, A Doctrine of Devils. *It is rather a Doctrine of Devils to teach so.*

19. Peter was not the Prince of the Apostles. *Peter was A, or, if you will, The Principal Apostle: but he was not the*

---

## The Entrance.

---

*Prince of any one of them, much less of all.*

20. The Bishop of Rome is Antichrist. *We are not so much agreed about this point, as to give in a full verdict: but we agree, he is Antichristian.*

21. The difference concerning Leaven and Easter is inconsiderable. *Where no danger of Schisms or confusions may alter the case, it is true.*

22. It is Heathenish to invoke Saints that reign with Christ. *Whether heathenish or no, may be doubted, they never worshipping any relating to Christ: But for all that, it may be, and is superstitious and idolatrous in the sense very current in the Roman Church.*

23. The Reliques of Saints are not to be worshipped. *We hold so indeed: though we hold they are to be respected relatively.*

24. The Saints in Heaven have no merits. *It is true, taken strictly and properly.*

25. Indulgences of the Church are vain. *They are not only vain but wicked, and generally blasphemous and ridiculous, as managed by the Church of Rome, contrary, or at least without all Precedents of the Christian Church, for many hundred years, viz. in remitting Sins or Punishments after this life, and that divers times before they are committed. Is not this fine, and wonderful ancient, and Catholick?*

26. Nothing is to be read in the Church besides Canonical Scripture. *This is rank Puritanism, contradicted by themselves in their practise, who read their Sermons, as well as others: and pray (which is equivalent to reading in this case) out of their own beads rather than Scripture.*

27. In Oecumenical Councils and Private for the explaining of the Doctrine of Faith, the consent of Lay-Princes is necessary. *It is necessary for the orderly assembling of such Councils. It is necessary for the giving any Secular enforcement unto them.*

28. That it is lawful for Lay-men alone, the Clergy opposing, to introduce the Ancient Religion. *This is true no farther then that of Gerson, which is alledged to this purpose: A Lay-man with Scripture on his side, is to be preferred before a Council without it. Supposing a monstrous Proposition, no wonder if a monstrous conclusion follows.*

29. He is no Bishop that teacheth not. *This is also a Puritan*

## The Entrance.

ritan strain: It being only true, that he is no faithful, conscientious Pastor, but either proud, or treacherous, or sloathful, or basely prudent, who doth not in person discharge his Office so far as he is able, without turning the care of his flock over to others: using that for an argument of keeping close in his Cabin, which is rather an argument of appearing in his charge; viz. Storms on the Church, Opposition the Faith and Orders of the Church meet withal, and difficulties obstructing the truth: It being both shameful and ridiculous, both in Bishop and Priest, to censure others for enemies to the Church, and for them so to wast it, in all mens esteem, in deserting it, and delivering it up to the care of others; themselves seeking little else then their temporal Harvest and ease. These men are over the Church indeed, but 'tis as the Extinguisher is over the Candle, to put it out. They pretend for themselves they have been sufferers for the Church: and so it should seem indeed by their carriage to it, in that through their scandalous negligence, as to their charge, they take a course to revenge themselves of it, by making it suffer as much, or more for them.

30. Faith alone justifies. *How this is held, we have even now, as also we shall hereafter more fully explain.*

31. There are no Merits in Good works. *There are none properly so called.*

32. Priests and Monks may marry. *'Tis true where the Church hath not denied that Liberty, and where they have made no Vow to the contrary, bereaving themselves of that Liberty.*

33. There is no Purgatory. *'Tis little less then Heretical, to affirm there is in the Roman sense.*

Artic. Chur.  
Eng. 22.

34. There is no external Sacrifice. *Most true in a strict proper sense.*

35. Devils cannot be driven away by Holy Water, and the Sign of the Cross. *By these alone, we have few or none Instances in the Ancient Church, that Devils were cast out of the Possessed. But many we find, and those most authentique and undeniable, whereby it appears that the ancient Christians, even to St. Chrysostoms dayes, did exorcise, or cast out Devils by Prayers and Humiliation, with which were used the sign of the Cross; but not so ancient was*



## The Entrance.

Holy Water to that purpose. And though we look on this as the Gift of Miracles, formerly more general and effectual then now-a-days it is any where honestly to be found, yet neither do we deny such power absolutely, nor hold such unnecessary Rites utterly unlawful to be used.

36. It is unlawful, and an horrible wickedness for a man to erect the Image of Christ in Christian Temples. No such matter: The wickedness consists in giving it the accustomed Worship in the Church of Rome.

And thus have I given certain Instances of the injurious dealings of both extreames against us, as by themselves stated: it being my design in the ensuing Treatise to state, rather then largely dispute, matters more equally, and thereby to discover the frauds and falsities current against us. I shall now requite their pains in collecting falsely and fraudulently the opinions of our Church, by a sincere and faithful proposing of the Heretical and pestilent Dogmes of the Roman Church, as I find them laid down and maintain'd by Bellarmine; that so even common reason, if not sense of indifferent Christians, may judge which Church holds most contrary Doctrines to Gods and Mans Laws.

Bellarmin. De  
Verbo Dei  
l.1.c.7.

1. The Books by us called Apocryphal, and so proved by the general Consent of the Church in all Ages, are Canonical and properly Divine.

L.2.c.15.16.

2. It is neither convenient nor profitable, that the Scriptures or Prayers of the Church should be in the Vulgar Tongue.

L.4.c.3.

3. All things necessary to Faith and Holy Life are not contain'd in the Scriptures; but Traditions also.

C.4.

4. Scriptures without Tradition are not simply necessary, nor sufficient.

C.4.

5. The Apostles applyed not their minds to write by God's command, but as they were constrained by a certain necessity.

C.12.

6. Scriptures are not Rules of Faith, but as a certain Monitorie to conserve and nourish the Doctrine received.

De Rom.  
Pontif. l.1.c.2.

7. Hereticks deny, but Catholicks affirm Peter to be the Head

## The Entrance.

Head of the Universal Church, and made a Prince in Christs stead.

8. When Christ said, *Simon* son of *John* (so the Vulgar Translation in *Bellarmino* corruptly for *Jonas*) Feed my Sheep, he spake only to *Peter*, and gave him his Sheep to feed, not exempting the Apostles. L. 4. c. 1.

9. Whether the Pope may be an Heretick or not, it is to be believed of the whole Church, that he can no ways determine that which is Heretical. L. 4. c. 2.

10. Neither the Pope, nor the particular Roman Church, can erre in Faith. c. 4.

11. The Pope cannot only not erre in Faith, but neither in Precepts of Manners, which are prescribed the whole Church, and which are concerning things necessary to Salvation, or things in themselves good or evil. c. 5.

12. The Pope alone hath his Jurisdiction immediately from Christ; but all other Bishops their ordinary Jurisdiction immediately from the Pope. c. 24.

13. The Pope hath Supream power indirectly in all Temporal matters, by reason of his Spiritual power. This is the opinion of all Catholick Divines. L. 5. c. 1. & 6.

14. The Pope, as Pope, may not ordinarily depose Temporal Princes, though there be just cause, as he may Bishops; yet he may change Kingdoms, and take them away, and give them to another, as the highest Spiritual Prince, if it be needful to the Salvation of Souls. Ibid c. 6.

15. As to Lawes, the Pope, as Pope, cannot ordinarily make a Civil Law, or establish or make void Lawes of Princes: because he is not the Political Prince of the Church: yet he may do all these, if any Civil Law be necessary to the Salvation of Souls, and Kings will not make them, and so if Laws be pernicious to Souls, and Kings will not abolish them. Ibid.

16. Though the Pope translated the Empire, and gave a Right to choose a Prince, yet he transferred not, nor gave that power Supream and most ample, which himself had of Christ over all the Church. And therefore, as when the De Translat.  
Imp. l. 3 c. 4.

## The Entrance.

Cause of the Church required, he could translate the Empire from the Greeks to the Germans, in like manner might he translate it from the Germans to another Nation, upon the like reason, &c.

Conti. Bar-  
clium. c. 51.  
Tom. 7.

17. No obedience is due to a Prince from the Church, when he is excommunicated by publick Authority. The Pope and his Predecessors never forbad Subjects to obey their Princes: for being once deposed by them, they were no longer lawful Princes. This is it we teach.

Tom. 2. de  
Concil. l. 1.  
c. 12.

18. To call General Councils belongs properly to the Pope: yet so, that the Emperor may do it with his consent.

L. 2. c. 5.

19. Particular Councils confirmed by the Pope cannot erre in Faith and Manners.

C. 17.

20. The Pope is simply and absolutely above the whole Church, and above a General Council: so that he may not acknowledge any Judicature on earth above him.

L. 3. c. 2.

21. The Church is a Company of men professing the same Christian Faith, joyned together in the Communion of the same Sacraments, under the Government of lawful Pastors; and especially One Vicar of Christ on earth, the Bishop of *Rome*.

De Purgat. l.  
1. c. 2, 3, 4, 5,  
6, 7, 8.

22. Purgatory may be proved out of the Old and New Testament.

Cap. 15.

23. Purgatory is a Doctrine of Faith; so that he who believeth not Purgatory, shall never come there, but shall be tormented in Hell in everlasting burning.

De Sanct. Bea-  
titud. l. 1. c. 19.

24. Invocation of Saints may be proved from Scripture.

De Reliq. c. 8.

25. It's lawful to make the Image of God the Father in the form of an Old Man, and of the Holy Spirit, in the form of a Dove.

L. 2. c. 21.  
De Inag.

26. The Images of Christ and of Saints are to be worshipped, not only by accident and improperly, but also by themselves properly, so that they may terminate Worship, as considered in themselves, and not only as they bear the place of the Example.

27. It



## The Entrance.

27. It may be granted that Images may be worshipped improperly, and by accident, with the same kind of worship with which the Exemplar, but not for their own sakes and properly---: and therefore *Latria* is not properly and for themselves to be given for them. C. 23.

28. A Vow is an Act of Religion due to God only, like as an Oath and Sacrifice; as appears from the Scriptures, whose Vowes are constantly said to be made to God--- Yet it is most certain that in some manner, Vowes may be made to Saints. L. 3. c. 9.  
De cultu san-  
ctor.

29. It is not probable that Christ [ in these words, *this is my Body* ] would speak figuratively. De Eucharist.  
l. 1. c. 9.

30. One Body may be in divers places at once. L. 3. c. 3.

31. That the Elements in the Eucharist are turned into Christs Body. L. 3. per tot.

32. It is a truth necessary to be believed, that whole Christ is in the kind of Bread, and whole Christ is in the kind of Wine. L. 4. c. 21, &  
22.

33. No more Grace is contain'd in one kind, then in both. c. 23.

34. Worshipping the Host excuses from Idolatry, because they believe there is no Bread remaining, and no Catholick holds that Divine Worship is to be given to Bread. C. 29.

35. Our Sacrifice is truly and properly called a Sacrifice, no less than the ancient Sacrifices, as is shown in the former Book. L. 2. de missa  
c. 2.

36. The Rite of Reconciling Sinners after Baptism, which consists of Repentance, discovered by external signs, and the word of Absolution, Catholicks affirm to be a true and proper Sacrament. De Pœnit. lib.

37. There is a treasure of superfluous Merits in the Church, which may by the Pope be applied to the benefit of other persons, by Indulgences. De Indulg.  
l. c. 2, 3, 11.

38. The Catholick Church doth openly affirm Extream Unction to be truly and properly a Sacrament. De Extrem.  
Unct. c. 1.

39. Orders are a Sacrament truly and properly so called. De Ord. c. 1.

## The Entrance.

De Matrim.  
c. 1.

40. Matrimony of Believers is a proper Sacrament.

To these, innumerable other might be added of *Strange nature* to the Word of God, and belief and practise of the ancient Church: but these are more then sufficient to confront those vainly objected to us by them: whereof some are most false, others most true, others false or true, as they may be taken.

And now the manner of proceeding in this Discourse being propounded to be touched in the second place, here must not be forgotten. In which I confess I have not a little varied from my first intention and resolution, which were in a plain compendious way, to set down the Principal Doctrine of Faith and Worship, agreeable to God's Holy Word, and to the mind of the best Ancient Churches, as well as our Own; and that without Passion or particular Reflexions on any Party or Person by name: knowing that of Synesius to be most true, That Soul which would be a Vessel to receive God, must be void of all Passions.

Δὲ κἀννὴν ἔδ  
τὴν ψυχὴν τὴν  
μέλλουσαν  
ἐπὶ τὸ δόχεον  
ᾧ θεῷ  
Synes.  
Ep 57.

But finding some things both approved and disproved by me, would scarce be credited without such instances, I held my self obliged to forsake that resolution in the process of my Discourse, and a little in the beginning, where I was forced by ill Paper and Ink to write somewhat over the second time, to make it legible: Otherwise I determined to avoid Names and Testimonies of Authors, after the manner of them who before me have written Institutions and Sums of this nature. Yet have I not taken upon me, in an imperious way, to multiply Canons and Axioms, and impose them with expectation of greater faith in them, then such men will allow to the Decrees of the Holy Councils, so called. And this with a perswasion, I know not how, or why wrought into credulous persons, that now-a-dayes only, Scripture is understood, and they only speak Scripture, but others humane Inventions. Which most bold demand, 'tis a wonder how many prone naturally to superstitious novelties do, without the least suspicion of vanity and falsity, readily receive for a most certain and fundamental Truth; but is indeed a fundamental Error, and the root of all Heresie towards the Faith; and of all Schism towards the Church. I remember how some years since, enquiring of one very near to me, what Divinity his Tutor grounded him in, he answered

## The Entrance.

answered me, Wollebius. And farther inquiring, what Wollebius said of a certain point, he replied, as he there found it: against which when I put in my exception, he wondered at me, and endeavored to silence me, by telling me, it was a Canon. I have not here proceeded so Canonically as others, nor yet so Polemically: but considering, according to St. Johns distinction, that there are Children in Christ, 1 John 2. 13. and Young men, and Old men, commonly call'd Incipientes, Proficientes, and Perfecti, (i. e.) Beginners, Proficients, and Perfect men; I have here pitched upon the mean sort of these to whom to direct my Labors; knowing there were but too many Catechises amongst us for the former, and too few Treatises, or none for the second. And that to write Polemically for the satisfaction of the third, required another more proper language, and a more Scholastical Person, and much more large Volumes then this one; though this Book hath increased under my hands well nigh thrice as much as I at first intended. And in truth, it is to be lamented and blushed at, that none of the Learned men of our Church have yet appeared in so noble and necessary a Work, as the fuller and more entire managing of the Elenctical part of Divinity, to the preventing daily mischiefs arising from the necessity of repairing to our Enemies of both sides, to perfect Theological Studies, without the due ballance on our side to prevent prejudice. I hope God will stir up the spirits of some to set their hands to, and enable them to go through so good a Work.

Voetius of Utrecht, than whom I think none of this Age hath been acquainted with more modern Authors, much complains for want of some compendious Body of Elenctical Divinitie, which to that day he had not seen: And therefore expected that long desired Piece of Famous Altingius, should at length come forth; which was only in the hands of his Scholars, in writing. Yet I find this Work of Henricus Altingius to have been published the same year with Voetius his Bibliotheca; viz. Anno 1654. and called Theologia Elenctica Nova: viz. New Elenctical Divinitie: which in truth hath not its name New for nothing; in that manner of handling Divinity as none before him; and the Matter it self far from judicious or solid, in many places.

*Certum autem  
rem ejus qui  
solidè, compen-  
diosè, & ac-  
comodatè ad  
nostra tempora  
hoc egat, h. Al-  
tingius non vidi,  
expectandum  
est ergo, &c.  
Voetius Bibl.  
l. 2. c. 5.*



## The Entrance.

Instru. Hist.  
Theol. l. 4. c. 4.  
§. 29.

*Much more wisely and learnedly had Joannes Forbesius of Aberdeen in Scotland, set forth his Controversial Work, called Instructiones Historico-Theologicae: yet imperfect, as it should seem by himself, who refers us to the twenty forth and twenty fifth Book of that Work, there being extant only sixteen. And surely, as the Book argues great Learning in the Author, so might it have proved no less beneficial to the Christian World, had there been less compliance with Calvin in it: which might be the reason that it found not that entertainment in England, that otherwise it might have had: but was commended and published to the World by Andrew Rivett: the Dutch Divines giving full approbation thereunto: to whom, it should seem, declining the judgment of that Church he stood more obliged to, he submitted his Work: which yet might be excused in part, it being a time (viz. 1645.) when such harcock and dissipation of the English Church was made by the Calvinizing Scots and Scotizing English, as were not to be excused, nor ever forgotten.*

*For mine own particular, I would not have any to expect here a Book of Preaching or Devotion: of both which (and especially the former) there seems to be little want amongst us; so neither purely Scholastical, but serving to all these purposes: And therefore I have wrote it in the English Tongue, aiming at no higher end, than to profit those of our own Church and Nation: And therefore I call it An Introduction, intimating my principal Intention to be, to prepare the way to the Readers ascent from this, to more high and ample Disquisitions: And this farther, according to the mind of the Church of England, I say this was my Purpose: I do not say that this I have always exactly and infallibly attained, any more than those Learned Writers before me, who have endeavoured to give us the sum of the Laws of our Nation, as I have of the Religion of our Church, have attained their ends, according to their desires, and therefore much less to the expectation of others.*

*Wherefore the Apology, which Learned Dr. Cowell used to the Reader of his Institutions of the English Laws, with some little variation may aptly enough serve my turn against the proneness  
of*

## The Entrance.

of some Censurers whom it may offend, that I take upon me to determine what the Church of England holds: when as there is, and alwayes will be, and that in all Churches, some Diversity in the Writers.

But as Littleton of old advised his Son, so would I advise you much more, that ye do not presently perswade yourselves that all things here collected are agreeable to our Law, for this is past our power: Yet such I may promise them to be, as will not be unprofitable.----- And I may safely adde, I have not invented any thing which I know to be repugnant to the Established Faith or Worship amongst us.

The Method that I here use, I hope is not obscure, nor un-  
useful to the Reader, nor Illogical; but consisting of parts cobering  
with one another; and succeeding each other visibly enough: though  
I know well I might have subdivided several Chapters and Heads  
into more distinct Sections; and peradventure might have erred  
and offended more on the other hand: as Seneca hath observed  
(and daily may be seen in the Compendiums on this Subject,  
of Forrein Writers) they do, who are too curious; confounding  
by distinguishing. In the general Division of this into two Parts  
I follow Gregorie Nyssene, who summeth up all Religion under  
these two Heads, Worship, which he calls *Ευσεβεια*, and the o-  
ther a Right Understanding of the true Nature of God. Only  
Natural Reason teaching every man that he must Know aright,  
before he can Do aright, I have set Knowledge, which is  
the same with Faith in a Christian, in the first place, and  
Worship in the Second Part of this Draught of Religion.

It remains now that, according to the custom of Adven-  
turers into the Censure of this captious Age, I should bespeak  
the favourable opinion, and friendly, or rather (in this case)  
charitable acceptance of my present endeavours, from the true  
Christian Reader; for from others, my hopes are very small:  
but I shall only crave the removing of that prejudice, and  
improving of that Purity of Intention in the reading, which  
I may with a good Conscience profess to have had in the writing.

*Ut autem Lit-  
tletonus suum  
filium, sic ego  
vos pramonitos  
multo magis  
esse cupio, ne  
omnia huc con-  
gesta furi no-  
stro consenta-  
nea, statim ex-  
istimetis. Negi-  
t enim hoc opus  
est infertalia  
tamen esse non  
injuria forte  
pillecor, &c.  
Johan. Cow-  
ellus Praefat.  
Institut. Juris  
Anglic.*

*Philosophiam  
in partes, non  
in frustra di-  
vidam: dividi  
enim illam, non  
concedi, utile  
est. Nam com-  
prehendere  
quemadmodum  
maxima, ita  
minima diffi-  
cile est. Senec.  
Epist. 89.  
— Αρετης  
διδασκαλια  
ης το κατα-  
λαον αγαθον  
η ευσεβεια η  
το της προ-  
σεπας σωλη-  
της μετ της  
θεας φουρας  
εχου.  
Greg. Nyss. de  
vita Moysis, p.  
180.*

## The Entrance.

Rom. 10. 1.

*And especially shall pray God to prosper it to those dissenting Brethren amongst us, who, I fear, are no less apt to take offense then our professed Enemies; as disagreeing from their persuasions in many things: But that is none of my fault. But my hearts desire and prayer to God is (with St. Paul) that they might be saved: For I bear them record, that they have a zeal of God, but not according to knowledge.*

*To inform therefore such, was my principal design, as likewise to exhort them in the fear, and for the love of God and the Truth, to consider at length, and lay seriously to heart the scandalous and most pernicious evil of that Division, for which as yet they have given no tolerable reason: which they can with any confidence persuade themselves will hold before God.*

*And having themselves wrote so many and horrible things against such Schism, all their allegations and complaints against their Governours for hard usage of their tender Consciences, are no more to be regarded by the Church, than the froward cries and carriage of Children, when their Parents would look their Heads, and take out their Vermine. For what is that moderation and compounding with us, they sometimes offer, and excuse themselves from the foresaid accusations by, as if they sought Peace and Unity, but to imitate the worst of Bankrupts, and thrive by breaking; now their open and most cruel dealings towards us have failed them? And which is most unreasonable of all, neither can, nor will give any just assurance of persevering in a true and cordial communion with the Church so modelled, as they propound in their Moderation, until it becomes such as they could wish: and that is quite to overthrow the whole visible constitution of it; as their Oaths and Covenants, not disclaimed, bind them. And to stick so immovably, as too many do, at lighter things, such as Rites and Ceremonies, which cannot possibly be convicted of moral evil, and so unconcernedly to omit the weightier matters of the Law, as Judgment, Mercy (or Charity in Unity) and Faith, what can Charity call this but meer Pharisaism? and where must such  
Pharisaism*



---

## The Entrance.

---

*Pharisaism end at length, but in Sadducism, even denying of the Blessings and Curses of a Future Life? For (as Drufius hath observed) it was one Reason alledged by the Sadduces against the Resurrection, If our Fathers had known the dead should rise again, and rewards were prepared for the Righteous, they would not have rebelled so often: not conforming themselves to Gods Rule (as is pretended by all) but conforming the Rule of Sin, and of Faith it self to the good Opinion they had of their own Persons and Actions: which Pestilential Contagion now so Epidemical, God of his great Mercy remove from us, and cause health and soundness of Judgment, Affection, and Actions to return to us, and continue with us, to the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ.*

*Si Patres nostri  
scivissent mor-  
tuis resurrectu-  
ro, & premia  
manere justos  
post hanc vi-  
tam, non tanta-  
per se rebellas-  
sent. Drufius in  
Mat. c. 3. v. 7.  
Item in c. 22,  
23.*



# THE CONTENTS OF THE CHAPTERS.

Chap. I.

**O**f the Nature and Grounds of Religion in General: Which are not so much Power as the Goodness of God, and Justice in the Creature. And that Nature it self teaches to be Religious.

Chap. II. Of the constant and faithful assurance requisite to be had of a Deity. The reasons of the necessity of a Divine Supreme Power. Socinus refuted, holding the knowledge of a God not natural.

Chap. III. Of the Unity of the Divine Nature; and the Infiniteness of God.

Chap. IV. Of the diversity of Religions in the World. A brief censure of the Gentile and Mahumetan Religion.

Chap. V. Of the Jewish Religion. The pretence of the Antiquity of it nulled. The several erroneous grounds of the Jewish Religion discovered.

Chap. VI. The vanity of the Jewish Religion shewed, from the proofs of the true Messias long since come, which are many.

Chap. VII. The Christian Religion described. The general Ground thereof, the revealed Will of God. The necessity of Gods revealing himself.

Chap. VIII. More special Proofs of the truth of Christian Religion: and more particularly from the Scriptures being the Word of God, which is proved by several reasons.

Chap. IX. Of the several Senses and Meanings according to which the Scriptures may be understood.

Chap. X. Of the true Interpretation of Holy Scriptures. The true meaning, not the letter, properly Scripture. Of the difficulty of attaining the proper sense, and the Reasons thereof.

Chap. XI. Of the Means of interpreting the Scripture. That they who understand Scripture are not for that authorized to interpret it decisively. The Spirit not a proper Judge of the Scriptures sense. Reason no Judge of Scripture. There is no Infallible Judge of Scripture, nor no necessity of it absolute. The grounds of an Infallible Judge examined.

Chap. XII. Of Tradition as a Means of understanding the Scriptures.  
Of

## The Contents.

*Of the certainty of unwritten Traditions; that it is inferiour to Scripture, or written Tradition. No Tradition equal to Sense or Scripture in Evidence. Of the proper use of Tradition.*

Chap. XIII. *Of the nature of Faith. What is Faith. Of the two general grounds of Faith. Faith divine in a twofold sense. Revelation the formal reason of Faith Divine. Of the several senses and acceptations of Faith. That Historical, Temporarie, and Miraculous Faith are not in nature distinct from Divine and Justifying Faith. Of Faith explicite and implicate.*

Chap. XIV. *Of the effects of true Faith in General, Good Works. Good Works to be distinguish'd from Perfect Works. Actions good four wayes.*

Chap. XV. *Of the effect of Good Works, which is the effect of Faith. How Works may be denominated, Good. How they dispose to Grace. Of the Works of the Regenerate. Of the proper conditions required to Good Works, or Evangelical.*

Chap. XVI. *Of Merit as an effect of Good Works. The several acceptations of the word Merit: What is Merit properly. In what sense Christians may be said to merit. How far Good Works are efficacious unto the Reward promised by God.*

Chap. XVII. *Of the two special effects of Faith and Good Works wrought in Faith, Sanctification and Justification: what they are. Their agreements and differences. In what manner Sanctification goes before Justification; and how it follows.*

Chap. XVIII. *Of Justification as an effect of Faith and Good Works. Justification and Justice to be distinguished, and how. The several Causes of our Justification. Being in Christ, the principal cause. What it is to be in Christ. The means and manner of being in Christ.*

Chap. XIX. *Of the efficient cause of Justification.*

Chap. XX. *Of the special Notion of Faith: and the influence it hath on our Justification. Of Faith solitary, and only. Of a particular and general Faith. Particular Faith no more an Instrument of our justification by Christ, than other co-ordinate Graces. How some ancient Fathers affirm that Faith without Works justifie.*

Chap. XXI. *A third effect of justifying Faith, Assurance of our Salvation. How far a man is bound to be sure of his Salvation, and how far this assurance may be obtained. The Reasons commonly drawn from Scripture proving the necessity of this assurance, not sufficient, &c.*

Chap. XXII. *Of the contrary to true Faith, Apostasie, Heresie, and Atheism. Their Differences. The difficulty of judging aright of Heresie. Two things constituting Heresie: the evil disposition of the mind, and the falseness of the matter. How far, and when Heresie destroys Faith. How far it destroys the Nature of a Church.*

Chap. XXIII. *Of the proper subject of Faith, the Church. The distinction and description of the Church. In what sense the Church is a Collection of Saints. Communion visible as well as invisible, necessary to the constituting a Church.*

Chap. XXIV. *A preparation to the knowledge of Ecclesiastical Society or of the Church, from the consideration of humane Societies. What is Society. What Order. What Government. Of the Original of Government; Reasons against the peoples being the Original of Power: and their Right to frame Governments. Power not revocable by the people.*

Chap. XXV. *Of the Form of Civil Government. The several sorts of Government. That Government in general is not so of Divine Right, as that*



## The Contents.

all Governments should be indifferently of Divine Institution, but that One especially was instituted of God, and that Monarchical. The Reasons proving this.

Chap. XXVI. Of the mutual Relations and Obligations of Sovereigns and Subjects. No Right in Subjects to resist their Sovereigns tyrannizing over them. What Tyranny is. Of Tyrants with a Title, and Tyrants without Title. Of Magistrates Inferiour and Supream, the vanity and mischief of that distinction. The confusion of co-ordinate Governments in one State. Possession or Invasion giveth no Right to Rulers. The Reasons why.

Chap. XXVII. An application of the former Discourse of Civil Government to Ecclesiastical. How Christs Church is alwayes visible, and how invisible. Of the communion of Christ and his Members. The Church of Christ taken specially for the Elect who shall infallibly be saved, never visible. But taken for true Professours of the Faith, must alwayes be visible, though not conspicuous in comparison of other Religions or Heresies.

Chap. XXVIII. Of the outward and visible Form of Christs Church. Christ ordained One particularly. What that was in the Apostles dayes, and immediately after. The vanity of such places of Scripture as are pretended against the Paternal Government of the Church.

Chap. XXIX. Of the necessity of holding visible communion with Christs Church. Knowledge of that visible Church necessary to that communion. Of the Notes to discern the true Church: how far necessary. Of the nature or condition of such Notes in general.

Chap. XXX. Of the Notes of the true Church in particular. Of Antiquity, Succession, Unity, Universality, Sanctity. How far they are Notes of the true Church.

Chap. XXXI. Of the Power and Acts of the Church. Where they are properly posited. Of the fountain of the Power derived to the Church. Neither Prince nor People, Author of the Churches Power: But Christ the true Head of the Church. The manner how Christs Church was founded. Four Conclusions upon the Premises. 1. That there was alwayes distinction of persons in the Church of Christ. 2. The Church was alwayes administer'd principally by the Clergy. 3. The Rites generally received in the Church, necessary to the conferring Clerical power and office. 4. All are Usurpers of Ecclesiastical power who have not thus received it. In what sense Kings may be said to be Heads of the Church.

Chap. XXXII. Of the exercise of political power of the Church, in Excommunication. The Grounds and Reasons of Excommunication. More things than what is of Faith, matter sufficient of Excommunication. Two Objections answered. Obedience due to commands not concerning Faith immediately: Lay-men, though Princes, cannot Excommunicate. Mr. Selden refuted.

Chap. XXXIII. Of the second branch of Ecclesiastical Power, which is Mystical, or Sacramental. Hence of the Nature of Sacraments in general. Of the vertue of the Sacraments. Of the sign and thing signified. That they are alwayes necessarily distinct. Intention how necessary to a Sacrament. Sacraments effectual to Grace.

Chap. XXXIV. Of the distinction of Sacraments into Legal and Evangelical. Of the Covenants necessary to Sacraments. The true difference between the Old and New Covenant. The Agreement between Christ and Moses. The Agreements and Differences between the Law and the Gospel.

Chap. XXXV. Considerations on the Sacraments of the Law of Moses. Of Circumcision. Of the Reason, Nature, and Ends of it. Of the Passover: the Reason why it was instituted. Its use.

Chap.

## The Contents.

Chap. XXXVI. Of the Evangelical Sacraments. Of the various application of the name Sacrament. Two Sacraments univocally so called under the Gospel only: The others equivocally. Five conditions of a Sacrament. Of the reputed Sacraments of Orders, Matrimony, and Extream unction in particular.

Chap. XXXVII. Of Confirmation. What it is: The Reasons of it. The proper Minister of it. Of unction threefold in Confirmation. Of Sacramental Repentance and Penance: The effects thereof.

Chap. XXXVIII. Of the proper Affections of Repentance, Compunction, Attrition and Contrition. Attrition is an Evangelical Grace, as well as Contrition. Of Confession, its Nature, Grounds, and Uses. How it is abused. The Reasons against it answered.

Chap. XXXIX. Of Satisfaction an act of Repentance: Several kinds of Satisfaction. How Satisfaction upon Repentance agrees with Christs Satisfaction for us. How Satisfaction of injuries, necessary. Against Indulgences and Purgatory.

Chap. XL. Of Baptism. The Authour, Form, Matter and Manner of Administration of it. The general necessity of it. The efficacy in five things. Of Rebaptization, that it is a prophanation, but no evacuation of the former. Of the Character in Baptism.

Chap. XLI. Of the second principal Sacrament of the Gospel, the Eucharist: Its names. Its parts, Internal and External. Its Matter, Bread and Wine: and the necessity of them. Of Leavened and Unleavened Bread. Of breaking the Bread in the Sacrament.

Chap. XLII. Of the things signified in the Sacrament of the Eucharist, the Body and Bloud of Christ. How they are present in the Eucharist. How they are received by Communicants. Sacramentally present, a vain invention. All Presence either Corporal or Spiritual. Of the real Presence of the signs and things signified. The real Presence of the signs necessarily infer the Presence of the Substance of Bread and Wine. Signs and things signified alwayes distinct.

Chap. XLIII. The principal Reasons for Transubstantiation answered.

Chap. XLIV. Of the Sacrifice of the Altar. What is a Sacrifice. Conditions necessary to a Sacrament. How, and in what sense there is a Sacrifice in the Eucharist.

Chap. XLV. Of the form of consecrating the Elements: Wherein it consisteth: Whether only Recitative or Supplicatory.

Chap. XLVI. Of the participation of this Sacrament in both kinds. The vanity of Papists allegations to the contrary. No Sacramental receiving of Christ in one kind only. How Antiquity is to be understood mentioning the receiving of one Element only. The pretended inconveniences of partaking in both kinds insufficient. Of adoration of the Eucharist.

Chap. XLVII. The Conclusion of the Treatise of the subject of Christian Faith, the Church; by the treating of Schism contrary to the visible Church. Departure from the Faith real Schism; not formally, as to the outward Form. Of the state of Separation or Schism. Of Separation of Persons Co-ordinate and Subordinate. Of Formal and Virtual Schism. All Heresie virtually Schism, not formally. Separation from an Heretical Society, no Schism: From Societies not heretical, Schism. Heretical Doctrine or Discipline justifie Separation. How Separation from a true Church is Schism, and how not: In what sense we call the Roman Church a true Church. Some Instances of heretical Errors in the Roman Church. Of the guilt of Schism. Of the noto-

---

## The Contents.

---

*rious guilt of English Sectaries. The folly of their vindications. That the Case of them and us is altogether different from that of us and the Church of Rome. Not lawful to separate from the Universal Church.*

### The Contents of the Second Book of the First Part.

Chap. I. **O**F the formal Object of Christian Faith, Christ. An Entrance to the treating of the Objects of Faith in particular.

Chap. II. Of the special consideration of God as the object of Christian Faith, in the Unity of the Divine Nature, and Trinity of Persons in that.

Chap. III. Of the Unity of the Divine Nature as to the simplicity of it. And how the Attributes of God are consistent with that simplicity.

Chap. IV. Of the Unity of the Divine Nature as to number, and how the Trinity of Persons may consist with the Unity and Simplicity of the Deity. Of the proper notions pertaining to the Mystery of the Trinity: viz. Essence, Substance, Nature, Person. The distinction of the Persons in the Trinity. Four enquiries moved. How far the Gentiles and Jews understood the Trinity. The Proof of the Doctrine of the Trinity from the New Testament, and the explication of it.

Chap. V. Of the proper Acts of God. Creation, and Preservation or Providence. What is Creation. That God created all things: And how? Of the Ministers of Gods Providence towards Inferiour Creatures, the Angels of God. Their nature and office towards man especially.

Chap. VI. Of the Works of God in this visible World. Of the Six dayes work of God. All things are good which were made by God.

Chap. VII. Of the Creation of man in particular, according to the Image of God. Of the Constitution of him: and of the Original of his Soul, contrary to Philosophers, and the Errors of Origen concerning it. The Image wherein it consists principally.

Chap. VIII. Of the Second General Act of God towards the Creature, especially Man, his Providence. Aristotles Opinion, and Epicurus his rejected. What is Providence. Three things propounded of Providence. And first the Ground of it, the knowledge of God. How God knoweth all things future, as present. Of Necessity and Contingencies, how they may consist with Gods Omniscience.

Chap. IX. The method of enquiring into the Nature and Attributes of God: Vorstius his grounds of distinguishing the Attributes of God from his Nature, examined. Of the Decrees of God depending on his Understanding and Will. Of knowledge of Intelligence. Vision, and the supposed Middle knowledge. The Impertinency of this middle knowledge invented in God. How free Agents can be known by God in their uncertain choice. Indifferent actions in respect of Man not so in respect of God. All vision in God supposes certainty in the thing known.

Chap. X. Four Doubts cleared concerning the Knowledge and Decrees of God: and free Agents, and contingent Effects. How man, that infallibly acts, is responsible for his Actions. The frivolous Evasion of the said difficulties by them of Dort.

Chap. XI. Of the Execution of Gods Providence in the Predestination and Reprobation of Man. How the Decrees and Providence of God are distinguished



## The Contents.

*stinguished. The Reason and Method of Gods Decrees. Righteousness is the effect, and not cause of Predestination to Life. Predestination diversly taken in Scripture, as also Election and Vocation. God predestinates no man simply to Death without consideration of Evil foregoing, as Calvin and some others would have it.*

*Chap. XII. Of Gods Providence in the Reprobation and Damnation of Man. Preterition is without any cause personal, but the corruption of the Mass of Humane Nature. Damnation alwayes supposes sin.*

*Chap. XIII. The occasion of treating of sin here. What sin is. What Evil. Monstrousness in things natural, and Evil in moral things, illustrate each other. Sin no positive or real thing. God the direct cause of no evil. St. Paul in his Epistle to the Romans makes nothing for the contra-Remonstrants literally and primarily taken.*

*Chap. XIV. Of Sin more particularly. And first of the fall of Adam. Of Original Sin wherein it consisteth: and how it is traduced from Father to Children. The Proofs of it. The nature and evils of it: And that it is cured in Baptism. That Natural Concupiscence hath not the nature of Sin after Baptism.*

*Chap. XV. Of the Restitution of Man after sin. The Means and Motives thereunto. In what manner Christs Mediation was necessary to the reconciling of Man to God. Socinus his Opinion of Christs mediation refuted. That Christ truly and properly satisfied by his Death and Passion for us.*

*Chap. XVI. Of the Nature and Person of the Mediatour between God and Man. In the beginning was the Word, proved to be spoken of Christ: and that he had a being before he was incarnate. The Union of two Natures in Christ explained. Christ a Mediatour by his Person, and by his Office, and this by his Sacrificing himself. The Scriptures proving this.*

*Chap. XVII. How Christ was Mediatour according to both Natures: Calvins Opinion and others stated. Of the effect of Christs Mediation and the extent thereof. Of the Designation and Application of Christs death. Of the sufficiency and efficacy of Christs death. How Christs death becomes effectual to all: The necessity of Gods Grace to incline the will of man to embrace Christ: Of the efficacy as well as sufficiency of Gods Grace on the Will of Man. Several Gradations observed in the Grace of God.*

*Chap. XVIII. Of the effect and benefit of Christs Mediation in suffering and rising again, seen in the Resurrection of Man. The necessity of believing a Resurrection. The Reasons, and Scriptural Testimonies proving a Resurrection. Objections against the same answered.*

*Chap. XIX. Of the most perfect effect of Christs Mediation, in the salvation of man. Several senses of Salvation noted. That Salvation is immediately after death to them that truly dye in Christ. And that there is no grounds in Antiquity or Scripture for that middle State called Purgatory: The Proofs answered. Of the Consequent of Roman Purgatory, Indulgences: The novelty, groundlesness, and gross abuse of them. The Conclusion of the first part of this Introduction.*

---

## The Contents.

---

### The Contents of the Second Part, &c.

Chap. I. **O**F the worship of God, wherein the Second Part of Christian Religion consists. Of the necessity of worshipping God. It is natural to worship God: Socinus holding the contrary, confuted. Of the name of Religion; the Nature of Religious worship, wherein it consisteth.

Chap. II. Of the twoparts of Divine worship, Inward and Outward. The Proof of Outward worship as due to God: and that it is both due and acceptable to God. Several Reasons proving bodily worship of God agreeable to him. Wherein this bodily worship chiefly consists. Certain Directions for bodily worship. Exceptions against it answered.

Chap. III. Of the second thing considerable in Divine worship; viz. The state wherein we serve God. What is a state. The formal cause of a state Divine, Vowes. What is a Vow. The proper matter of Vowes, Evangelical Councils. That it is lawful and useful to make Vowes under the Gospel, contrary to Peter Martyr. The nature of Vowes explained.

Chap. IV. Of the matter of Vowes in particular. And first, of the Virginal state, that it is both possible and laudable. And that it is lawful to vow Celibacie, or Widowhood. No Presidents in the Old Testament favouring Virginity. The Virgin Mary vowed not Virginity, no Votary before the Annunciation.

Chap. V. Of the second State of special serving God, the Clerical State or Ministerial. Of the necessity and liberty of singleness of Life in a Clergyman. The Opinion and custom of Antiquity concerning it. That it is in the power of the Church at this day to restrain or permit the marriage of Priests. The Conveniences and Inconveniences of wedded Life in Priests. Chrysostom's Judgment of Marriage and Virginity recited.

Chap. VI. Of the third State of serving God, a Life Monastical. That it is not only lawful, but may be profitable also. The Exceptions of Mr. Perkins against it, examined. The abuses of Monastical Life touched. That it is lawful to vow such a kind of Life, duly regulated.

Chap. VII. Of Religious worship, the third thing considerable in it, viz. The Exercise of it, in the several kinds of it: And first of Prayer, the chiefest act of Gods worship: contrary to Sectaries who are enemies to it in three respects: And first by their vain conceit of Preaching, wherein consisteth not the proper worship of God, as in Prayer.

Chap. VIII. A second Corruption of the worship of God, not, especially in Prayer: by opposing Setforms of publick worship. Reasons against extemporary Prayers in publick: The places of Scripture, and Reasons and Antiquity for Extemporary Prayers, answered.

Chap. IX. A third abuse of the worship of God by Sectaries in neglecting publick Prayers without Sermons, censured. That Prayer in a publick place appointed for Gods worship, ought at all times to be offered to God. Scripture and Universal Tradition require it above that in private places. The frivolousness of such reasons as are used against it. The Reasons for it.

Chap. X. A fourth Corruption of the worship of God, by confining it to an unknown Tongue. Scripture and Tradition against that custom. A fifth abuse of Prayer, in denying the People their Suffrage contrary to the ancient practise of the Church.

Chap.

## The Entrance.

Chap. XI. Of the Circumstances of Divine worship, and first of the proper place of Divine worship, called the Church, the manner of worshipping there. Of the Dedication of Churches to God: their Consecration, and the effects of the same. That no man can convert any part of the Church to his private use, without profanation of it and Sacrilege. Against the abuse of Churches in the burial of dead bodies, erecting Tombs, and enclosing them in Churches or Chancels. Rich men have no more Right to any part of the Church than the Poor. The Common Law can give no Right in such Cases.

Chap. XII. Of the second Circumstance of Gods worship; Appointed times, Of the Sabbath or Seventh-day; how it was appointed of God to the Jews, but not by the same Law appointed to Christians: Nor that, one day in Seven should be observed. The Decalogue contains not all moral duties directly. Gentiles observed not a Seventh day. The New Testament no where commands a Seventh day to be kept holy.

Chap. XIII. Of the Institution of the Lords Day. That it was in part of Apostolical, and partly Ecclesiastical Tradition: Festival dayes and Fasting, derived unto us from the same fountain, and accordingly to be observed upon the like grounds. Private Prayers in Families, to the neglect of the publick worship, unacceptable to God. Of the Obligation all Priests have to pray daily according to their Office. Of the abuse of Holy-dayes in the Number, and unjustifiable occasions of them. Of the Seven Hours of Prayer approved by the Ancient Church, and our first Reformers. Mr. Prins Cavils against Canonical Hours refuted.

Chap. XIV. The third thing to be considered in the worship of God, viz. The true object, which is God only. That it is Idolatry to misapply this Divine worship. What is Divine worship properly called. Of the multitude and mischiefs of New distinctions of worship. Dulia and Latria though distinct, of no use in this Controversie. What is an Idol. Origen's criticism of an Idol, vainly rested on. What an Image. What Idolatry. The distinction of Formal and Material Idolatry upon divers reasons rejected. The Papists really Idolatrous notwithstanding their good Intentions pretended. Intention and Resolution to worship the true God, excuses not from Idolatry. Spalato, Forbes, and others, excusing the Romanists from thence disproved. That Idolatry is not always joyned with Polytheism, or worshipping more Gods than one. How the Roman Church may be a true Church, and yet Idolatrous

Chap. XV. Of Idolatry in the Romish Church, particularly; viz. In worshipping Saints, Angels, Reliques, and especially the supposed Bloud of Christ. No good foundation in Antiquity or the Scriptures for the said worship.

Chap. XVI. Of the fourth thing wherein the worship of God consisteth, viz. Preaching. How far it is necessary to the Service of God. What is true Preaching. Of the Preaching of Christ, wherein it consisteth. Of painful Preaching. That the Ministry, according to the Church of England, is much more painful then that of Sectaries. The negligence of some in their duty, contrary to the rule and mind of the Church, not to be imputed to the Church, but to particular Persons in Authority.

Chap. XVII. The fifth general Head wherein the exercise of the worship of God doth consist, Obedience. That Obedience is the end of the Law and Gospel both. That the Service of God principally consisteth therein. Of Obedience to God and the Church. The Reasons and Necessity of Obedience to our Spiritual, as well as Civil Governours. The frivolous cavils of Sectaries noted. The severity of the Ancient and Latter Greek Church in requiring obedience. The folly of Pretenders to obedience to the Church, and wilfully



---

## The Contents.

---

*slight her Canons and Laws more material, than are Ceremonies.*

Chap. XVIII. *Of Obedience to the Church in particular, in the five Precepts of the Church common to all, viz. 1. Observation of Festival dayes. 2. Observation of the Fasts of the Church. Of the Times, Manner, and Grounds of them. Exceptions against them answered. 3. Of the Customs and Ceremonies of the Church. 4. Frequentation of the publick worship. 5. Frequent Communicating; and the due preparation thereunto.*

Chap. XIX. *A Preparation to the Explication of the Decalogue, by treating of Laws in General. What is a Law? Several kinds of Laws Of the obligation of Laws from Justice, not Force only. Three Conditions required to obliging. Of the Ten Commandments in special. Their Authour, Nature, and Use.*

Chap. XX. *Of the Ten Commandments in Particular; and their severall sense and importance.*

Chap. XXI. *Of Superstition contrary to the true Worship of God, and Christian Obedience.*

---

T H E



A N  
INTRODUCTION  
TO THE  
Knowledge of the true Catholick Religion.

*Part the First. Book the First.*

C H A P. I.

*Of the Nature and Grounds of Religion in general:  
Which are not so much Power, as the Goodness  
of God, and Justice in the Creature. And that  
Nature it self teaches to be Religious.*



RELIGION is the supream act of the Rational Creature; springing from the natural and necessary Relation it beareth to the Creator of all things, God Almighty. Or, a due Recognition of the Cause of all Causes; and Retribution of service and worship made to the same, as the fountain of all Goodness derived to inferiour Creatures. For there being a most excellent order, or rather subordination of Causes in the Universe; there is a necessary and constant dependance one upon another; not by choice, but natural inclination: And the Perfection of all Creatures doth consist in observing that station, and serving those ends, and acting according to those Laws imposed by God on all things. Thus the Heavenly Bodies moving in a perpetual and regular order, and the Earth being fruitful in its seasons, and the course of the Waters observing the Laws given them by God, may be said to worship and obey him.

Psal. 148.

Τῷ γὰρ δα-  
 λείν τῷ Θεῷ  
 μύριον ἀν-  
 μα καὶ ὁ μόνον  
 ἐλάτρεται  
 ἀλλὰ καὶ πλεί-  
 ον, καὶ ἀρχὴ  
 πάντων, ὅσα  
 τῶν θνύτων  
 ἀσπαζέται,  
 τιμώμενον.  
 Philo Ju-  
 daeus Alle-  
 goriarum  
 lib. 2.  
 Papin. L. Si-  
 quis. ff. De Re-  
 ligioſ.

Macrob. Sat.  
 c. 7. p. 37.

him. Which worship being performed according to that more perfect state of the Rational Creature, and the prescriptions given to it, may be called Religion. And nothing can be more fundamentally Just then for the Creature to refund, according to its ability and rank, the Fruits of those perfections received from the Cause of all Causes; especially, considering that such retribution is rather an augmentation then diminution of such Perfections in the Creature. For not onely are all things thus freely derived from God to the Creatures, but by a perpetual act of Providence, called Conservation, continued to them; together with a most various and bountiful supply of all things requisite thereunto: to which no Creature could lay any claim, either to have, or to hold. And therefore, most just, equal, reasonable, and honourable it is, for it to make such a Re-exhibition to God, as is called Religion. Therefore that famous Heathen Lawyer said well, *Summa ratio est qua pro Religione facit. The highest Reason of all, is that which makes for Religion.* And Tullie in a certain place defines Religion thus briefly, and aptly, *Religio est Justitia erga deos, Religion is Justice towards the gods.* And Macrobinus makes Pietie and Religion, two of the seven parts into which he divides Justice.

These not onely truly Christian, but natural grounds of sober Men may suffice to put to silence the brutish Philosophie of some of late, who acknowledge no other grounds of Dominion, either Divine or Humane, or of Obedience thereunto, but Power, and Force enabling to exact and extort the same; not considering that Protection on the part of the Governing, and Profit and Benefit on the part Governed, do create a debt of veneration and service. And therefore by the same reason should Justice have no place in the Ruler; but onely his Power and Pleasure, to incline him to govern well: as it should have no place in the Governed, to obey well.

Psal. 8. 6, 7, 8.

And not only from the special benefits derived from God, should Man return the mite of his recompence, or recognition by Religion; but also from a subordination of Creatures serving him, should he be moved to pay the like to God. The Psalmist tells us that God hath put all things under Mans feet: *All Sheep and Oxen, yea and all the beasts of the Field. The Fowls of the Air, and the Fish of the Sea, and whatsoever passeth through the paths of the Seas.* From this example therefore, Subjection and subserviency of all inferiour Creatures to Man, by the appointment of God, doth appear the reasonableness of Mans subjection unto God. Neither was this (though forfeited by Man upon his first disobedience against God) so lost unto him, but it was confirmed unto him after the Flood in these words, *And the fear of you; and the dread of you, shall be upon every beast of the Earth, and upon every Fowl of the Air, and upon all that moveth upon the Earth, and the Fishes of the Sea; into your hand are they delivered.* This Fear therefore and dread of a Divine Majesty, is that which God hath in like manner laid upon Man, as the ground and cause of all religious worship of him: Man being infinitely more inferiour and subject, by nature, to God, then the Beasts are to him. For as Lactantius hath it, *That which is not feared is contemned, that which is contemned cannot be worshiped: and so it comes to pass, that Religion and Majesty, and Honour consists of Fear.* Which the Scripture assures us of also; where it saith, by David and Solomon both, *The Fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom.*

Gen. 9. 2.

Quod non metu-  
 itur, contemni-  
 tur: quod con-  
 temnitur utique  
 non colitur. Ita  
 fit, ut Religio,  
 et Majestas,  
 et honor metu  
 constet, &c.  
 Lactant. de  
 Ira. Dei. c. 8.  
 Psal. 111. 10.  
 Prov. 1. 17.

And



And notwithstanding all Creatures do exhibit obedience unto Almighty God, yet none may properly be said to be Religious, but Man. For Religion must be a service, and a tendency to Perfection, and union with God; but the Blessed Spirits of Men and Angels are out of their Apprentiship, and imperfect state, and consummated in that fruition, and reward, and union with God, which they are capable of. And the Apostate Spirits, though they give obedience to God, cannot be said to be Religious, because their wills are constantly, and utterly rebellious; and all is involuntary and forced: but Religion must be free, and voluntary, as is intimated by the Psalmist. Again, Irrational Creatures or Beasts cannot be said to be Religious properly, though they may be said to be Obedient: For Obedience may consist, as with necessity in Devils, so with ignorance and necessity both, as in Beasts: But Religion must be rational; as St. Paul implieth in these words, *I beseech you brethren, by the mercies of God, that ye present your bodies a living Sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God, which is your reasonable service.* Whatsoever worship the Creatures give unto God is principally performed by their Head, Man: Man being, as the first born, and eldest Son to God, in comparison of them. So that as it was a natural Law, that the eldest of the Family and most worthy should be as a Priest to the rest, to offer Sacrifice unto God for all the rest; as *Cain* and *Abel* are interpreted to bring their offerings to *Adam* to present them to God: so do the Beasts bringing their several tributes to Man, through him offer their bounden service unto God.

Psalm 110.

Rom. 12.1.

## CHAP. II.

*Of the Constant and Faithful assurance requisite to be had of a Deity. The reasons of the necessity of a Divine supream Power. Socinus refuted, holding the knowledg of a God not natural.*

**A**LL Religion supposeth a Deity; as all Arts and Sciences suppose their foundation upon which they are built, and not prove it. Yet notwithstanding for the more effectual knowledg and perswasion hereof, and for the due exercise of that natural notion of a God, which many times is very weak, for want of use (as men sometimes loose the use of their bodily Limbs for want of due exercise of them) we shall briefly recount (for methods sake) some of those many demonstrations of a Divine supream Being, which is God, and that by these gradations.

First, That there are purer and superiour *Beings* to Man, though not obvious to any of the five gross senses of man, may be gathered from the effects supernatural to all corporeal Creatures, and ordinarily visible. Such are the suddain and rapid translations of Bodies from one place to another. Such are likewise, voices heard without any notice given to the eye of persons present: Such are Apparitions made to diverse in all ages of Spirits, to persons, in the likeness of Bodies indeed, but declar-

ring by their manner of entrance, their manner of motions and actions, their manner of departure and disappearing; that such forms are only assumed, to render their presence more obvious to us. Such are lastly the many Predictions and Revelations of closest and deepest secrets of men, not possible to be known but by a preternatural subtilty: All which are so frequently reported in Histories of all sorts, Divine and Humane, that whoever will call in question must be judged purposely to have taken on him such incredulity, that he might deny this thing; seeing there are infinite other things, which upon no greater evidence, he firmly believeth. And what greater absurdity need a man be forced to than this singularity of judging in this cause? For can they who resolve to doubt of this matter, alledge any sense or demonstration contrary to this? If they can, Why have they kept it from the World all this while? If they cannot, Why should they not yield to better grounds for it, than they have any against it, viz. the concurrent testimony of so many and sober persons affirming the same, from their experience?

Hebr. 1.9.  
Hebr. 12.9.

But if this be admitted, then, by due gradations may we easily ascend unto the most supreme Being of all, which is God. No man being able to determine any point which may not be exceeded, until we come to infinity it self. And this present visible World being but a draught of that super-natural, God was pleased to ordain Man to bear his Image in a Supremacy over all earthly Creatures; that from hence we may learn, that as one Creature serves another, and all, Man; so Man is subordinate to Spirits, and created Spirits to God, as their only absolute Lord. And therefore in Scripture it is said of them, *They are all Ministering Spirits* (i.e. under God) *to them that believe*: And that he is the *Father of Spirits*. Which necessary and harmonious dependence of all things on One, is so consonant to the common reason of Man, that the contrary, introducing a Deity or independence, doth withal bring in a manifest Anarchy, and confusion in the Universe, repugnant as well to nature as reason.

Furthermore, the several Arts and Sciences minister several proofs of this, as might be shewn in particular: would it not be too long, and were it not to be found performed by others already. That taken from the course of Nature may here suffice. Nature it self, and common observation tell us, that there is diversity in Cause and Effect, and that there is Generation and Corruption; and that nothing in the World can produce it self: And (for instance) he that lived many thousand years ago, could no more make himself, then he that lived but yesterday, or was born this morning. So that either Man, and if Man other creatures also (for there is the same reason) made himself, or was from eternity, or was made by another. The first is disproved. The second is false. First, because nothing hath been esteemed more absurd in reason than for to arise to an Infinity of Causes, one above another. Secondly, then certainly would, the same man, yea all men be eternal: *consequently*, as well as *antecedently*; but the contrary to this, we daily see, and therefore may conclude the contrary to the other.

Thirdly, The very nature of Creatures constituted of divers and contrary natures, which are opposite and avers to all union, as Fire and Water, Wet and Dry, Heat and Cold, cannot move of themselves to that which is contrary to them; but every thing naturally covets to be of it self, and in it self; Fire making towards Fire, and Water to Water, and Earth to Earth; so that there must be a superiour power, as well to bring them,

them, and joyn them together in one, as to contain, and continue them there. Which must be the first Cause, and that first Cause is God.

Fourthly, That common ground of all Societies, humane Justice, which is an immoveable and indelible principle in the mind of Man, approved of by all, doth evince this. For Justice supposes and infers a Deity. For all Justice doth suppose a Rule, according to which it is said to be just, and a Law: to contradict and oppose which, is to be unjust and injurious. For otherwise, it would be at the pleasure and arbitrement of every man, to make a Rule to himself, and for another; according to which all that pleased should be reputed just: But this would be one of the most absurd, ridiculous, and unjust things in the world. Therefore must there of necessity be a common Rule of Right and Just: which can proceed from none but the Author of all Beings, and humane Society it self: without which, it would be as reasonable, if it were profitable and safe, for any man to murder his Prince, or his Father, as to kill a Nitt, or Flea, that troubled him. For the Civil Sanction of Laws to the contrary, doth not make the foresaid impieties, sins; neither are they simply evil, because they are forbidden thereby: But they are forbidden by Man, and fenced by humane Laws, because they are evil: and evil they were absolutely, because God had so decreed them. And as the Laws of all Sovereigns receive their Original vigour from God, so were it not that Gods Law fortified, confirmed, and secured Kings, they, and their Laws both would be no better than trifles, impertinencies, and impostures; which every wise man might shake off, and confound, when ever it lay in his power. For where obedience and subjection is due, it is for some reason, which reason is form'd into a Law. But no man can make a Law whereby he, of no King, should become a King: for before he can make any Law, he must be a King or Supream: And therefore this reason or Law must be Antecedent; and being so, must have an Author: And who can that be but God, the King of Kings, and Lord of Lords?

*Meo judicio  
Pietas est foun-  
damentum om-  
nium virtutum.  
Cicero pro  
Planio.*

Fifthly, Add hereunto that argument which is commonly taken from the common consent and agreement of all Men, esteemed most rational; all People, all Nations, concurring hereunto. Which must needs be the effect of a Divine power, and influence, so inclining mens minds, so that, one saith, *It is so apparent that there is a God, that I can scarce think him to be in his right mind, who denies it.* And when we speak of Nature, and a Law of Nature, we would not be so understood, as some would needs take them, to help them out here; for such a necessary and inevitable principle, and impulse as none should be able to dissent from: for there is no such Law to be found, but so natural we make it to all indifferently and equally disposed, that the thing once fairly and fully propounded, shall not find contradiction without violence offered, at first, to the mind of man, bent to such a truth.

*Cicero.*

Sixthly, It is no weak argument of an over-ruling and supream Power, which may be taken from the contrary attempts, the vanity and infelicity of them. For it was just now granted, that great Wits (as they would be called) may, nay have disowned this truth. But first, consider we the silliness of their reasons, and weakness of their arguments against a Deity, who will yield to nothing but manifest, palpable, and invincible demonstrations for it; and it will be sufficient to confirm any sober mind in the faith of it. For how many hath Pride, to be thought some body extraordinary in maintaining Paradoxes; Singularity, to find out somewhat new



\* Όταν ἡμῶν  
 ἰσχυροῦσι καὶ  
 πρὸς τοὺς ἀν-  
 τισταμένους  
 ἡμῶς τὴν ἀπο-  
 στάσιν αὐτοῖς,  
 ὡς ταλαιπώ-  
 ροις, καὶ μη-  
 κενοῖς, καὶ  
 ἀνοήτοις, καὶ  
 ἀδυνάτοις, καὶ  
 ὄντων ἐν  
 αἰσχροῦ δια-  
 κήρυξι.  
 \* Ὡς γὰρ τὸ  
 πνεῦμα ὑμῶν  
 ἔστι καὶ μετενο-  
 οῦντες, καὶ  
 ἔτι, τὸ ἀποστῆναι  
 ἀποστασίας, καὶ  
 ἐνσταλῆς, καὶ  
 πρὸς τὸν  
 κλητὸν ἀνομιαν  
 καὶ ἐνστάσιν.  
 Chrysost. In  
 Hebræos  
 Ser. 4.

new (as *Lactantius* observed of those Philosophers that were reputed Atheists) that took upon them such opinions, because they could find out nothing else to make themselves talk on and famous: How many hath boldness and impudency, vain-glory and to appear free and illimited in their opinions and practices? How many hath Riot, Lust, and such like excesses converted to this kind of infidelity, more then Sobriety or Philosophie? It is, alas, no wit, no choice, no freedom, or generousness of mind at all: If (as *Chrysostome* hath said) the nobleness of the mind consisteth in believing the high and noble things) but a contracted stupidity, or sordid servility, and unavoidable necessity to enjoy themselves in their low and base courses, which constrain them to these persuasions unnatural to them. But I deny not but some of the Learned, and for ought we know, grave Philosophers, have inclined to Atheism, as have many Great, Rich, and Powerful. But first, however some Princes have been dogmatical within themselves, and Practical Atheists in their unjust dealings towards others, yet never dared they to commend or incourage such principles in their Subjects, nor discover professedly such to their Neighbours by reason of the visible and monstrous mischiefs presently and naturally rushing out of them, to the ruin of themselves and others. And can that be a truth which is so pernicious to the Authors, and promoters of it, all over the World? Again, Can there be any thing more required to prove a thing to be irrational, and absurd, then that it should never by all countenance and advantages given to it by Power, and Learning, be able to prosper into any one Society upon earth? That it should never prevail so far as to be generally and publickly owned in any one Land or Nation? But, like a flash of wild-fire, make a noise, and a show, and presently come to nothing. Never could Atheists yet, from the Creation to this present, unite into a Body, or become a Commonwealth; but against all endeavours and devices, when Religion has for a time been discountenanced and crushed by impious Agents, it hath recovered it self again in despite of its adversaries. Which shews that it is implanted in Man, as a natural principle, which may be oppressed, but never extinguished.

For whereas *Socinus* and his crew of late, would prove that Religion is not natural to Man, from some remote Indians, who, he says, acknowledged no God. It is hard for any to make that good: But were it so: It doth not overthrow our opinion here, which teaches chiefly such a naturalness, as upon presentation of the thing to the mind of man, outwardly; doth meet with such compliance inwardly, as may well be called *Natural*. And besides, a principal doubt was, whether infinite People directly and positively asserting, and believing a Deity, any one can be found which dogmatically oppose the same? None of *Socinus* his instances reach to this. And it is not so improbable but inhumanity it self may have prevailed over some people so far as to have buried all Civility in them. And what wonder is it, or what weakning to our Cause in hand, that they, who have ceased to be men, should have layd aside Religion? I do not think Divinity, or the belief of a God more inseparable from Man, then common humanity: and yet I may hold it natural too.

## C H A P. III.

*Of the Unity of the Divine Nature, and the Infiniteness of God.*

**N**othing is so intimate and necessary to the very Being of a thing, as the Unity of it; as say Philosophers. Of the Unity of the Deity, therefore as necessary to Faith, we shall here briefly speak. Where first it is to be noted; to the advantage of the Faith holding there can be but one God, that though many great Wits have attempted boldly to deny a God; yet none of them, who have granted a Deity, have ever so much as denyed the reasonableness of that Opinion, which asserts the Unity of such a Deity: All generally looking on it as an Excellency to the Divine Nature, to be but One: However it is written of some ancient Hereticks, what is scarce to be found amongst the wiser sort of ancient Natural Philosophers, that there was a God of Evil, as well as of Good; conceiving indeed so far aright, that the most Perfect absolute good, cannot produce directly what is evil; but erring herein, that they either thought that to be evil which was not so in it self; as evil Beasts, poysonous Plants, excessive Tempests, and the like; or supposing that what was really evil must have some positive and direct Agent to produce it; which upon due examination will be found contrary to reason.

And surely, though the first thing, and most obvious to common apprehensions is, that there is a God, absolutely; yet this being granted and supposed, it is much more easie to convince an adversary, who shall call in question the Unity of God, that he is but one, then that he is, simply: So immediately and necessarily does it follow from the very subject it self. For what does the very notion of God imply and include in it, but a thing most absolute, most perfect, most glorious, most entire; and whatsoever, and more then what ever the mind of Man can comprehend of excellency? But if there be more then one God, and these distinct and separate in nature, or space, then is there in one, what is not in the other; and the one is what the other is not, for else they were not divers, or many, but one, which is argued against by Doubters: And if the properties or perfections of one be not communicated to the other, but remain peculiar to each, nothing can be more certain and apparent than that all perfections are not united into one Being: and so consequently, that Being imperfect, and defective in something, and so not absolutely and simply perfect, and so not God; whom we suppose to be most perfect, or not at all.

And the general and wise concord and harmony found in the World, do strongly convince the unity of the *First Cause*, and mover thereof. True indeed, some contrarieties and contentions are seen in particular creatures of opposite natures, and qualities; but this doth rather argue the Unity of a Sovereign power, which doth reconcile them into a commodious agreement, and ornament of the Whole. So that as in Musick, some light passing Notes of discord do add grace and sweetness to the

Parts,

*Deum cum audis, substantiam intellige, sine initio, sine fine, simplicem, sine ulla admixtione, invisibilem incorpoream, ineffabilem, inestimabilem, in quo nihil cadendum, nihil creatum sit, sine autore. Ruffinus in symbolum.*

Athan. cont. Gentes p. 41. Tom. 1.

Athanas. ib.  
p. 42.

*Si sint duo quare non plures?*  
Tertul. cont.  
Marcionem l.  
1.c.5.

*Quid intersint  
Numeri quum  
duo paria non  
differant uno?*  
*Una enim res  
est que eadem  
in duobus. Id.*  
ibid.

*Equidem unum  
esse Deum sine  
initio, sine pro-  
de natura, seu  
Patrem mag-  
num atq; mag-  
nificum, qui  
tam demens,  
tam mente cap-  
tus neget esse  
certissimum?*

*Hujus nos vir-  
tutes per mun-  
dum esse diffu-  
sas multis vo-  
cabulis voca-  
mus, &c. Max-  
imus Mad. &c.*  
August. Epist.  
43.

Parts, the petty particular disagreement of Creatures illustrate and commend the excellency of the Order of Creatures in the World. And as it is yet further impossible, but if two several Musicians should compose a Lesson, or Song consisting of several Voices, not consulting with one another, but from their several phantasies and humours; these put together must needs make horrible jarring, and discord; so were there more than One God, who should have an hand in framing this Universe, it could not possibly have been avoided but the infinite and destructive inconveniencies in the parts thereof would betray the absurdness of such different Agents. Again, if there were more Gods than one, there may as well be believed to be more than a hundred, then a thousand, then ten thousand, and so on. For who shall limit or determine them? And so the World would be like a Common-wealth, which should have more Sovereigns than Subjects. Neither can it be imagined with any reason, that such a multitude of gods should hold a Common Counsel, and lay their heads together (as Poets have devised) for the wiser management of their Kingdom of this world: because all such deliberations and consultations do imply a particular defect of power, and knowledge, which are made up in some manner by the concurrence of many, supplying such single defects: But this supposition quite overthrows the Divine Nature.

And farther, either these supposed Gods must be equal, or inferiour to one another, in their Attributes: If the latter, then must such inferiour ones be turned out of the List, as insufficient and incapable of such an high dignity. If equal, to what purpose are many invented, when two or more differ not from One?

Sixthly, Infiniteness and Unity are convertible in the inquiry after the nature of God: For if God be Infinite, he must necessarily be but One; if he be One, he must necessarily be Infinite: Nothing less then Infinite answering the onely less then Infinite necessities of Creatures in the World: which all stand in need as well of support and governance, as of a First Cause to produce them.

7. Lastly, The same consent of Nations and People, as hath been intimated, agreeing in but one GOD, as well as in this, *That there is a God*, sufficiently evinceth this. For not to speak of the more stupid, who are no competent Judges in such cases (who notwithstanding readily assent to this noble truth, once propounded) but the more Learned and Wise, who, upon disquisition and search, duly and thorowly made, have ever unanimously received this for a most certain truth.

CHAP.



## CHAP. IV.

*Of the diversity of Religions in the World. A Brief censure of the Gentile, and Mahometan Religion.*

**H**itherto have we treated of Natural Religion, as it were; that which all men by the light and force of principles put into Man by the hand of God, who made him; so that scarce doth the Infant turn more naturally to the breast of the Mother; than doth Man arrived to the years of reason and common understanding, seek to God, by way of recognition, and dependance on him. But this one end, to which all tend so unanimously, admitteth of many roads leading thereunto: which particularly to enumerate, were both superfluous and tedious; and therefore may well be reduced to these four, Heathenish, Jewish, Mahometan, and Christian, which are so many Religions according to which One God is worshipped.

The Heathen, or Gentile (as the Scripture calls him) worship a God; and surely desiring (as all men naturally do) not to err, or be deceived; especially in such matters, as are of greatest importance (as the choice of a Deity is) do likewise rudely intend to adore none but the true God. For (as St. Paul well noteth, and teaches us in his Epistle to the Romans) *the Creature was made subject unto vanity, not willingly, but by reason of him who hath subjected the same in hope.* By which creature he doth certainly mean the Gentile; who according to the phrase of Holy Writ, speaking according to the received sense and opinion of the highly opinion'd Jews; was reputed no more of then a simple creature, and nature: in opposition to which St. Paul often makes mention of another, and New creature, as *He that is in Christ Jesus is a New creature*: and elsewhere. And by Vanity is commonly understood, False Gods and Idols; as in *Jonah, They that observe lying vanities, forsake their own mercies*, meaning False Gods: as the Prophet *Jeremie* likewise affirmeth of the Heathens Gods, *They are but vanity, the works of mens hands.* Now the Creature, or Gentiles were unwillingly made subject to these Vanities and false worships, in respect of that general Principle inserted in Man, whereby he chooseth truth before error, and consequently the true God before the false: however, through some particular Blindness of their understanding, and darknes, *their hearts be alienated from the Life of God*, or from the living God, which is the same. Which Darknes of the heart may well be imputed to that Original defect, or sin traduced from Adam to all his Posterity: Yet notwithstanding, even after that general waste made in the Soul of Man, God; as St. Paul well tells them, *left not himself without a witness, in that he did good, and gave us Rain from Heaven, and fruitful seasons, filling our hearts with food and gladness.* So that the Invisible things of him (as saith the same St. Paul) *from the beginning of the World, are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even his eternal power and godhead; so that they are without excuse.* And the reason hereof goeth before, *Because that which may be known of God is manifest in them, for God hath*

Rom. 8. 20.  
2 Corin. 5. 17.  
Gal. 5. 10.  
Jonah. 2. 8.  
Jerem. 10. 15.  
Ephes. 4. 18.  
Acts. 14. 17.  
Rom. 1. 20.  
Ez. V. 19.

C

shewed

*shewed it unto them.* The invisible things of God are said to be seen clearly, because they are sufficiently exposed to be seen; and therefore if they do not see them, it must be the affectation of some sensual error which so darkens their mind, that they cannot, or will not.

And being thus first corrupted, no marvel if their Religion be like unto it, not only false but unreasonable and abominable; as may appear from these few, amongst infinite reasons. First from the Object of their worship generally directed to a multitude of Gods; and patching up a plenitude of power out of the shreds of innumerable Demi-gods, or pieces of Gods; whereof one should have power and vertue in one thing, and another in another: but this is to deny God in effect, who, if he be not absolute, is not at all; and indeed, all the arguments before used to prove there can be but one God, do prove that to be a false and foolish Religion which alloweth and worshippeth more than one: Neither can it suffice to excuse them, to say, that the wisers of the Heathens acknowledged but one God; because it availeth nothing at all but to add to their condemnation, for any persons to have a right sense and meaning reserved to themselves, and to proceed directly contrary to such sound judgment, in their practice and worship it self.

And therefore the most absurd and abominable manner of worshipping their pretended Deities, is sufficient conviction of the Religion it self. For whereas, modesty, sobriety, temperance, chastity, truth, justice, and the like moral virtues, were such as the Light of Nature did command to all men, and all consented to be excellent and laudable: All these were contemned by the admirers of these Gods; yea the very Religion it self tempted and incited many to offend against all these; and that (which is most intolerable) from the examples of the pretended gods so chusing to be worshipped; from whence must needs follow what St. Paul affirmeth of the Gentiles Religion, and gods. *The things which the Gentiles sacrifice, they sacrifice to Devils and not to God.* They were impure, and wicked spirits delighting in absurd and vitious practises. And therefore, upon this subject, no more need be spoken at present.

The Neat pretender to true worship may be the Mahometan, who worshipping the True God so far as may be discerned, yet faileth egregiously in the manner of exhibiting the same: the very grounds, and end also being false and unreasonable. For, first; that the Author and Coiner of that worship was an impostor, and made pretences of Sanctity in the midst of impurities and infirmities he was subject unto, is apparent out of Histories of those times and places, where he, by the assistance of a Fugitive Nestorian Monk laid the plot and whole design of his Religion, and that among a people altogether rude, ignorant, barbarous, easie to be deceived, and cheated into a credulity of pretended Revelations.

Again, the many absurdities and contradictions of their Law most sacred: as misnaming of persons, mistiming of Facts, mistaking of Histories in the gross, impossible, prophane, blasphemous opinions concerning the nature, the will, the Actions of God, contrary to common philosophy and reason; Ridiculous and foolish imaginations of Angels; utterly false opinions of the nature of things, and such like, being duly and soberly weighed and examined, do convince the whole Fabrick of that superstition, of Idleness and foolish fictions.

And not to multiply more arguments here: The way of propagating this erroneous Fashion of serving God, discovereth the Error of the thing

thing it self. For it is a general and most rational Principle deserving admission and belief of all, That Religion, being the most excellent act of humane Creatures, ought to have the most high and noble Faculty of the soul for its proper seat and fountain, from whence it should proceed; such as is the intellectual faculty of Man. But this superstition is carried on by the ministry of the Senses, chiefly. And moreover, It ought to have for its end the most sublime and divine of all. But the Mahometan constituteth the low pleasures of the Senses, as the sufficient and proper end of all their service: making the beatitude of Heaven to consist in perpetual Licentiousness, and fresh delights of senses. And therefore no need of insisting on this subject, here: What is here spoken being for method sake rather than necessity, or a formal confutation of those Errours.

## CHAP. V.

### *Of the Jewish Religion. The Pretence of the Antiquity of it nulled. Their several Erroneous grounds of the Jewish Religion, discovered.*

**B**UT the Religion of the Jew requireth more diligent examination, as well because of a notable presumption from ancient Tradition, and a certain preoccupation of divine truths; and authority of divine Constitution; as because the consideration thereof is an introduction to Christian Religion, and the disproof of that, a proof of the Christian.

And if according to Christians own concessions, and the eminentest Apostle St. Paul, they were once the people and true Church of God, *To them were committed the Oracles of God. To them pertained the Adoption, and the glorie, and the Covenant, and the giving of the Law, and the service of God, and the Promises:* Why not alwayes a Church? If once Gods people, Why not alwayes so? If once confessed to be pure and Faithfull; When did they cease to be so? When first entred corruptions into their Church? Under what High Priest? And who brought such errours first in? Rom. 3. 2; cap. 9. 4.

This is the sum of what they can say either for themselves, or against the Christians; of whose Religion (which undoubtedly they do, and will call Heresie) they can give the time and place, when, and where it sprang up; and the person who first founded and advanced the same. And if any Church or Society of men in the world can lay claim to the Promises of perpetuity and infallibility, surely the Jewish will pretend much more, from the Prerogatives peculiar to them: as do witness every where, the Law and the Prophets,

To all this a sufficient answer shall be comprehended in the prosecution of the contrary Grounds. which here follows, which I reduce to these two; whereof One concerns their Errour about their Law, and the Other, about their Messias.

The first general Errour concerning their Law is first that they suppose



that the word of God given to *Moses* for their proper use, was equally to oblige all Nations: saving where certain priviledges were pretended to Jews by birth, which they suppose no people were worthy or capable of, except the stock of *Abraham*. But that all nations could not be included in that Covenant which was made with *Abraham*, nor were all obliged to the Rites and Ceremonies thereof, appears, from the ordinary impossibility of being observed by all People. For how could people of the remotest parts of the earth appear thrice a year at Jerusalem, as was commanded the Israelites by God, who dwelt in the Land of Canaan? How could all Nations at any time bring their Sacrifices to the door of the House of the Lord, to be there received and offered by the Priests?

Levit. 12. 6.

Another Error concerning their Law received by *Moses* is, that they say, It was it whereby men should be justified. Which is false; and that, First, because the most ancient, holy and renowned Patriarchs of the Jewish Line were not so Justified: They were not justified by the works, rites, or Ceremonies of the Law delivered them by *Moses*; as Saint *Paul* hath not only taught us, but irrefragably proved against them in several places of his Epistles. For the summ of his Argument, and force may truly be reduced to this form, as it is laid down more largely in his third Chapter to the Galatians, Judaizing, after the embracing of the Gospel of Christ: That way whereby *Abraham*, *Isaac*, *Jacob*, and the most holy and renowned Patriarchs of the Jewish Line were justified before God, must needs be it which God chiefly intended for the Justification of their Posterity, to whom all the promises of God were made, through them: But neither *Abraham*, nor *Isaac*, nor *Jacob* were Justified by the Law of *Moses*, so religious and rigorously now insisted on. The first part of this reason will be easily granted by the Jews, because they were the principal of the Jewish nation, and honoured by God above any that succeeded them; and therefore undoubtedly Justified by God. But that this justification could not be according to, or by the Law of *Moses*, Saint *Paul* in the forecited Chapter apparently proves: where he shews that the Law was four hundred and thirty years after *Abraham*. And how could that which then had no being be a cause of justification of *Abraham*?

Galat. 3.

V. 17.

Galat. 3. 6.  
Gen. 16. 6.  
Gal. 3. v. 7.

Again, the accounting of Righteous before God, is to be justified before God: But *Abraham* was accounted Righteous before God, by Faith, and not by Law: For so saith the Scripture, *Abraham believed God and it was accounted to him for righteousness*. Therefore, *They that are of Faith, they are children of Abraham*. that is: They, who believed and live as did *Abraham*, are *Abraham's* spiritual seed, and heirs apparent of all the Promises made to him, whereby all nations (not the Jewish only) should be blessed.

Deut. 27. 26.

Gal. 3. 10.

Furthermore, No man could ever be Justified by that law, but may rather be said to be condemned and cursed by it, which he nor no man else did ever keep: And the law saith expressly, *Cursed be he that confirmeth not all the words of this Law to do them*: which *Confirming* is well explained by the Apostle by *Continuing*. For who ever by disobedience breaketh it, cannot be said to confirm it, or continue in it. Now, seeing all flesh failed more or less in the due observation thereof, there must be provision otherwise made by God, if so be he would have any saved. It will perhaps be here said, That God in such cases had appointed Sacrifices for expiations, and reconciliations with him: But against this, not so much the Authority, as the Argument of the same Apostle makes in his Epistle to the

Hebrews

Hebrews, saying. *In those Sacrifices there is a remembrance made of sins, once every year.* That is, notwithstanding there were daily Sacrifices made according to the Law, every day; and upon special sins peculiar Sacrifices made by the offender for an atonement; yet every year, to shew the insufficiencie of the Precedent Ceremonies, mention was made of the sins of the People, when the High Priest entred into the Holiest of Holie. And the reason of this imperfection is given by the Author to the Hebrews, when he argueth, First, from the nature, the Sacrifices themselves, That it is impossible that the blood of *Bulls and of Goats should take away sins*: or as one of their own Prophets before him intimateth, saying, *Wherewith shall I come before the Lord, and bow my self before the High God? Shall I come before him with Burnt offerings and Calves of a year old? Will the Lord be pleased with thousands of Rams, or with ten thousands of Rivers of oil? Shall I give my first born for my transgression? The fruit of my body for the sin of my Soul?* And so again in the book of the Psalms: *Sacrifices and offerings thou didst not desire, mine ears hast thou opened: Burnt-offerings and sin-offerings hast thou not required. Then said I, Lo I come, in the volume of the book it is written of me, &c.* All which, with many such like places, do declare what esteem Good and Godly men had of the Legal Sacrifices, that were but in themselves insufficient and unacceptable to Almighty God, for either the expiating and satisfying for sins, or the appeasing of God offended by the same: and therefore some further remedie, some more excellent means of reconciliation were necessary: And this appears from the ends of such Sacrifices instituted: which principally were these. First, to declare a right that God had in all those Creatures, which he had given man for his use, and service. Secondly, to represent to man the guilt and punishment, unto which he was subject, by his sins; as verily, as that beast so slain and sacrificed before his eyes. Thirdly, to insinuate unto him the true means of becoming reconciled unto God offended: which was,

A Second general end of the Old Law, which was to prefigure the Messias, and only true Saviour of the world: who related not only to *Abrahams* seed, but to all, to whom the promise made to *Abraham*, related, viz. *In thy seed shall all the Nations of the earth be blessed.* And therefore if such an objection be made, *Wherefore serveth the Law*, if not to such Ends? Saint Paul answereth thus, *It was added because of transgressions, to whom the Promise was made. Because of Transgression.* First, by reason that the Oral Covenant made with *Adam*, and renewed to *Abraham*, suffice not, of it self, to contain man in his dutie, without the additional statute committed to writing by *Moses*, called signally, *The Law*. Secondly, this became to them under it, a rule and direction, until such time as the seed, to whom it was promised, *should come.* i. e. The fulness of the Gentiles, to whom, through *Adam* and *Abraham* both, the Messias was promised. Whence appeareth the vanitie of the Jews imagination, supposing that God, by an immutable decree, had affixed the priviledges and benefits of the Gospel, entirely to the Jews. And this inferrs another argument used by Saint Paul against the perfection, and perpetuity of the Jewish Law. For nothing was promised to *Abraham* and his seed peculiarly, but upon the Covenant of Circumcision. But *Abraham* was not reputed righteous before God, by vertue of Circumcision; but being Righteous, was Circumcised; and all the principal Promises made to *Abraham*, as the Father of the Faithful, were before Circumcision, as the historie in Genesis assures us, and Saint Paul to the Romans argueth; and concludes against the Jews, *They*  
which

Heb. 10.

V. 4.

Mic. 6. 6.

7.

Psal. 4. 6. 7.

Gen. 22. 18.  
Galat. 3. 10.

*which are the children of the Flesh, are not the Children of God: that is, in that respect, or for that cause; because they were lineally descended from Abrahams flesh and blood: but the Children of the Promise are counted for the Seed. i. e. They were the persons comprehended in the Covenant, and promises made to Abraham: all which sufficiently nulls the Jews pretensions, taken from their Law. We now proceed to the Second general Head against them, taken from their Messias.*

## CHAP. VI.

*The Vanity of the Jewish Religion, shewed from the proofs of the true Messias long since come, which are many.*

**B**Oth Jews and Christians agree, that the Covenant made by God with *Adam* and *Abraham*, was through the Messias. But the difference between them is notwithstanding very great. The Jews, still expecting the Messias to come, and the Christian believing it, as the first Article of his Faith, that he is actually come, and hath delivered his Laws, and performed all things prefigured and promised by the Law of *Moses*. If this supposition of the Christian be not true; then is the whole Bodie of his Faith a meer shadow, and false. And if the Messias be come, then is the Religion of the Jew false, and no better then a vain Superstition. This therefore is diligently and Faithfully to be enquired into: though with this Caution premised, That it is a thing to be supposed no less, and taken for granted in the Christian Religion, that Christ the Messias is come; then it is to be supposed to Religion in general, that there is a God.

*These following Circumstances evince the Messias to be come. First the certain expiration of the time prefixed by the Holy Scriptures, and the Jewish Doctors themselves, for the coming of Christ. The great Masters of the Jews affirm that the world shall continue six thousand years; whereof two thousand are to go before the Law, and two thousand should be under the Law of Moses; and that in the fifth thousand year, the Messias should come into the world. Who these are, and from whence they collect this, is no place to shew here; Genebrard, Galatinus, Raymundus Martini, have done it; and many of the Fathers receiving their tradition from them, have spoken to that purpose: But the Jews themselves do reckon from the Creation to this day, above five thousand four hundred years: and yet there is no appearance of a Messias for their turn. So that being driven to this extremitie, they have been constrained to take up this curse, to secure their suspected Cause, viz. Let the Spirit of all them be burst in pieces who compute times; as Buxtorfe relates to us. And if it be so, as some Jews have phancied, viz. That the Messias was born the same day their Temple was burnt at Jerusalem; Where has he spent his time all this while? Why doth he not appear to their deliverance? They are wont to say, It is for their sins. In which I agree with them, that indeed it is for their sins, that they*  
are

Sixtus Senen-  
fis Bibl. lib. 2.  
Genebr. Chro.  
initio.  
Vid. Rayl.  
mundum Mar-  
tini Pag. fidei  
Part. 2. cap. 6.

תפח רוחן  
של בחשבי  
קיצין

Buxtorf. Sy-  
nagog. cap. 3.  
Vid. Raymun-  
dum Martini,  
Pag. fidei  
Part. 2. cap. 6.



are never like to see that Messias, whom they dream of, because they rejected him who came to them, as the true Messias.

Secondly, The apt Analogie and correspondence between the Messias received by Christians, and foretold by the ancient Prophets, doth declare him come. For instance, that of Genesis, *That the seed of the woman should break the Serpents head.* That in Deuteronomie, *A prophet shall the Lord your God raise up of your brethren, like unto me &c.* That of Esay the seventh and thirty fourth verse, *Behold a Virgin shall conceive, and bring forth a child, and they shall call his name Immanuel:* (however modern Jews endeavour to pervert and corrupt that text.) That of the Psalmist *The Lord said unto my Lord, sit thou on my Right hand, until I have made thine enemies thy footstool.* That of Micah, *And thou Bethlechem Judah art not the least amongst the Princes of Judah: For out of thee shall come a Governour which shall rule my people Israel.* And many more like places are interpreted of the Jews themselves, of the Messias. And it being so, whom have they to show (now the time is past) that many stand in competition with Christ, our true Messias?

Thirdly, several Events prove the Messias already come. In Genesis it is said, *The Scepter shall not depart from Judah, nor the law-giver from between his feet, until Shiloh come &c.* And so in Numbers, *there shall come a Star out of Jacob, and Scepter out of Israel.* And in Esay, *To us a Son is born, to us a Child is given: and the Government shall be upon his shoulders.* And by the same Prophet it is said, *In that day shall the Branch of the Lord be beautiful and glorious &c.* To which many other places might be added: All which we urge, not upon our own authority but the judgement of their ancient Rabbies, especially that Famous Chaldee Paraphrast so applying them. Now these can belong to none but him, whom we acknowledge for the Messias, Christ Jesus: though diverse Impostors, and false Christs have pretended to such Prophecies, to the delusion and confusion of that unhappy and blind Nation: as Christ truly foretold. And however great varietie may be found amongst Learned Christians concerning the precise times, wherein the said Predictions had their verification, yet all unanimously agree that they are fulfilled; the Jew in vain dissenting.

Fourthly, the Destructions and Dissipations of that Nation and Church prove the truth of the Messias come. For now so great obscurity and confusion are found in their best Records, and especially, their Genealogies, upon which depend their assurance of their Messias, that not knowing now, them of the Tribe of Judah, from them of any other Tribe; and much less the Line of David, from others: They are not able to distinguish a vain pretender, from a real heir of *David*, and so must needs suspect all pretenders to be the Messias.

Fifthly, by vertue of the Ancient Prophecies and promises made unto the Jews, by their Predecessors, their form of worship was to continue unto their Messias at least: but nothing is more plain than that this is actually dissolved; and that in the most material parts of it. Their holy City Jerusalem, their more Holy Temple in it, and their most Holy Altar in that, are all ruined and buried in oblivion: and a Mock City built in opposition to that, by *Alius Adrian* and from him called *Elia* properly.

Sixthly, The unparalleld Judgments of God continually pursuing that Nation, until the accomplishment of all things foretold by Christ, and his Apostles, concerning destruction to come upon them, to the utmost, confuteth their Expectations, and confirm our Faith in Christ, as the true Messias. For First, about the time of Christs Coming into the world, the Scepter

See Chrysostom, Sermon. 9. Against the Jews, Tom. 6. p. 338, 339.

Gen. 3.

Deut. 18. 15.

Esa. 7. 34.

Psal. 110.

Mich. 5. 2.

Gen. 49. 10.

Numb. 24. 17.

Esa. 9. 6.

Esa. 4. 2.

John 5. 43.

Εἰμὶ τὸν ἄνθρωπον

παρὰ τὸν νόμον

τὸν βασιλεῦς,

ὃς περὶ τῆς

θεῶς, καὶ τῶς

ἀνθρώπων τῆς

ἐκείνης τῆς

ἐκείνης τῆς

ἐκείνης τῆς

ἐκείνης τῆς

ἐκείνης τῆς

ἐκείνης τῆς

ἐκείνης τῆς

ἐκείνης τῆς

ἐκείνης τῆς

ἐκείνης τῆς

ἐκείνης τῆς

ἐκείνης τῆς

ἐκείνης τῆς

ἐκείνης τῆς

ἐκείνης τῆς

ἐκείνης τῆς

ἐκείνης τῆς

ἐκείνης τῆς

ἐκείνης τῆς

ἐκείνης τῆς

ἐκείνης τῆς

ἐκείνης τῆς

ἐκείνης τῆς

ἐκείνης τῆς

ἐκείνης τῆς

ἐκείνης τῆς

ἐκείνης τῆς

ἐκείνης τῆς

ἐκείνης τῆς

ἐκείνης τῆς

ἐκείνης τῆς

ἐκείνης τῆς

ἐκείνης τῆς

ἐκείνης τῆς

ἐκείνης τῆς

ἐκείνης τῆς

ἐκείνης τῆς

ἐκείνης τῆς

Scaliger. Pro-  
leg. in Chron.  
Euseb.

Philo Judeus  
de Legatione  
ad Caium.

Deut. 28, 68.

of all Political and Ecclesiastical Power was utterly taken from them. Herod that Alien (what ever *Scaliger* and some others siding with him say, making him a Jew) invaded all civil Power, and kept it to himself; and then proceeded to baffle all Sacerdotal Rights; Killed most of the Heads of the Principal Families: and, at his pleasure, put in and out Priests: as also the Romans did likewise. All which some find in the Miserie of Christs age, when he was put to death. For it is observed that there were thirty Jubilees from the time that the Israelites first entred into the Land of Promise until the Coming of Christ to preach and publish the Gospel: at which time the Scriptures tell us, that he was about thirty years of age: after which time, there were never any more kept by that People. And that John the Baptist, (who was the Voice in the wilderness preparing the way for Christ) was that Trumpet, which was to sound at the Publication of the Evangelical Jubilee; and cessation of the Legal; and abolition of the whole Fabrick of that Church. For (to proceed in the historie of their miseries and ruine) about the Fourtieth year after the birth of Christ, and scarce seven years after his death and Passion, (whereby they had brought the curse of innocent blood upon themselves, and children) a very sore calamitie seised all that people at once; by the Emperour *Caligula* his commanding his Statue to be erected amongst them, as a God: which caused a great slaughter of them at *Alexandria*, and confusion in Judæa. And when *Philo Judeus* of *Alexandria* attempted to satisfie and pacifie the Emperour, without it; himself witnesses, with what shame, scorn and sharp reprehension he was repulsed, and thrust out of the Emperours presence. Who thereupon, with his philosophie, endeavouring to comfort his brethren, with expectation of Divine assistance, found himself deceived; their troubles multiplying upon them, until the death of that Emperour. About the same time in Babylon and Seleucia perished about 50000, under the Grand Mutinier *Annelus*. About the year of Christ 68, *Florus* Procurator of Syria crushed the Jews two years together, until rebelling against the Romans they were set upon by *Cestius* the Roman General; who slew great numbers of them; wasted their Country, took their strong holds of Defence, held against the Romans and rased them; came to Jerusalem it selfe, and might have taken that also, but that God had reserved them to greater mischiefs, and vengeance; the Roman army being called off upon other occasions. In the thirteenth year of *Nero*, the year after, *Vespasian* under the Emperour was recalled out of Achaia to invade and reduce the Jews, to more absolute obedience and subjection, who coming into Gallilee destroyed the Country, and put to death no fewer then 100000 persons, and led captive with him to the number of fourty thousand: in the year 72, *Vespasian* himself being Emperour, sent his son *Titus* into Jewrie to finish the conquests of those mutinous and obstinate Countries, and after devastations of the same, coming to the siege of Hierusalem it self; so many and unparallel'd were the miseries suffered by them that no age or history could equal them till at last taking the City, firing the Temple against his will and strong endeavour, by the tacit and irresistible decree of God, there were numbred of those that perished in the City no fewer then 1100000; and about fourtie thousand Captives: with the sale of which all persons were glutted, refusing them at the lowest and basest rates: the prophecie of old being at this time especially verified, *Ye shall be sold to your enemies for bond-men and bond-women, and no man shall buy you.* This ruine and waste so quelled and broke them that they were disabled and disheartned for divers years

years to attempt any mischiefs, but about the year 116 under *Trajan* the Emperour, Gods Justice began to awake against them farther. For in several parts of the Roman Empire, as it were by consent, at the same time rebelling, they slue of Greeks and Romans above two hundred thousand, and as many in the Island of Cyprus alone; but *Trajan* sending the Roman Forces amongst them, destroyed innumerable thousands of them. In the year 130. mutinying again under *Adrian* the Emperour, being seduced by a false Prophet, and Christ, *Barchocab*, they were destroyed with great slaughter. And five years after mutinying again, *Julius Severus* was called out of Britain, and going against them, destroyed fifty thousand of them, with fifty strong holds, nine hundred principal Towns, rasing eighty to the ground, leaving the Land in a manner desolate. And the year following finished the work by destroying five hundred and eighty thousand Jews, besides an infinite multitude which perished by Exile and Famine: all the Jews being forbidden to remain in any part of Judea, or so much as to look back upon it: Jerusalem is laid quite waste, and another City built not far from it, named (as is said) *Ælia*, from *Ælius Adrianus* the Emperour. And to pursue these miserable obstinate wretches no farther, since that time (which is as great an Instance as any hath been, or can be given of Divine wrath against them) though they be in numbers great, and in riches too, and industrious, and zealous for their superstition, they have been both so insatuated and blasted in all their counsels, and designs, that they could never make a Society amongst themselves, so far as in any part of the World to be governed within themselves, or exercise their Religion, but by restraint, and at the will and pleasure of others. Now to conclude; That that should be the true Religion which for these sixteen hundred years could no where be truly practised, or exercised according to the pretended obligations of their Law, the ground and form of the same, is incredible, and next to impossible. Or that the true Messias should not be actually come, or Christ should not be he, whose predictions and Justice have been so manifestly verified upon his implacable enemies, and withal, hath so far raised and exalted, and asserted, and propagated, and defended the believers in him, is most unreasonable to doubt of, after such convictions and evidences.

But last of all, Let any indifferent judge compare the Doctrine and Services of the Jewish Superstition, with the received Rule and ground of it, the Old Testament, and he shall easily discern, how they have by their many Talmudical inventions, their bold and ridiculous Comments upon the Scripture, held in no less, if not much greater veneration than the Scripture it self, their infinite absurd and directly false Traditions (imposed upon all of their way) as Oracles; turned their Faith into Fables, and their Facts to have no agreement with the Letter of their Law; but newly invented most of them, except Circumcision: (which we have shewed they have not as Jews) and he will undoubtedly conclude against their antiquated Religion, and Innovated Superstitions.



## C H A P. VII.

*The Christian Religion described. The General  
Ground thereof. The Revealed Will of God.  
The Necessity of Gods Revealing himself.*

**A**FTER the consideration of Religion in General, and the reasonableness thereof, with the Exclusion of the principal false pretenders of worshipping the true God; it follows to treat of the Christian Religion, and the Reasonableness, and several incomparable Prerogatives thereunto proper. And first, it is to be known, what we mean by Christian Religion, and what it is?

Christian Religion is the worship of the only true God in the unity of nature and trinity of persons, through one Mediatour between God and man, the Man Christ Jesus; according to his Will and Laws revealed in his holy Word, commonly called the Scriptures. This description whether artificial enough I will not contend, but full enough I suppose it is, to declare as well, What it is in it self, as Wherein it is distinct from others. And therefore omitting to treat of the more curious and formal part thereof, we shall here shew briefly What great advantages it hath above any other, to the obliging us to a more faithful and devout observation thereof; and that this only, and no other can truly please God, and lead us to him, and crown us hereafter with eternal bliss and glory.

And it having been proved that by the consent of all Nations there is a God; and it following more strongly upon that ground supposed, that such a Supream and Infinite being is to be worshiped, and that this worship is that which we call Religion; and that of the Religions pretending to be divine, the others have been found vain and deficient, the Right of being received, as the only proper worship of God, must of necessity devolve upon the Christian Religion, as that which is least obnoxious to the same, or like exceptions; and hath many more sober and rational inducements to persuade the same to any equal judgment. Which argument might well be drawn from the very Body of this Religion, and the several parts whereof it consisteth, together with manifold Pregnant Circumstances attending the same. But because this would ask a far longer time, and more tedious labour both to Writer and Reader then can consist with this intended Compendium, it may abundantly suffice to give such probable and credible proofs of the Scriptures, That they are the revealed will of God as Christians do believe, without question. For the sum and substance of all Christian religion, so far as it is truly so called and professed, being founded on the Holy Scriptures, and there expressly contained, if it be evinced that they are of divine Original, it will follow, That what they deliver is so likewise; and consequently, the Religion built upon them.

But because it is one Principle which Christian Religion is built upon, in common with all Religions, that somewhat must so be believed that no natural reason or Mathematical can invincibly demonstrate. And the reason hereof is, because the ground of all such demonstrations is settled upon the

the order of Nature between Cause and Effect; in point of right rather than matter of fact. But that the Scriptures are so the word of God, as to be revealed by his Holy Spirit to certain select Persons to that end, is altogether matter of fact: and that not proceeding from such a necessary and natural Agent, as that according to the course of Causes and Effects it could be no otherwise; but from a free Agent which certainly might have suspended such acts of Revealing his Will. And the same Reason holds against all proper Demonstration from Effect. For as it cannot be demonstrated that such a Cause must necessarily have such an Effect, it cannot be infallibly proved that such an Effect must have such a Cause. For unless it could be proved that fire must necessarily burn, it could not be proved that what we see burnt must necessarily proceed from fire. For before this can be done, it must be shewed that nothing in the world has the same virtue, but fire: and this supposes that we have a perfect and exact knowledge of every thing, and the nature of it, in the world. Take we an instance yet nearer to our present subject. It is a common Maxime amongst the Schoolmen, That no Creature can work a Miracle of it self, but it must have the Supernatural power of God, either immediately or mediately: and, That whatsoever Effects are wrought by any Spirit inferiour to God, deserve not the name of a Miracle. And yet it is confessed withall, that diverse such works which appear to us as extraordinary, and above nature, are not of God, but some (perhaps evil) Creature. Must it not then first be known, what those extraordinary acts are, and how they are wrought, before it can be concluded that they are of God? And how can this infallibly be discern'd but by another miracle, and this by a third, a third by an infinity, of which there can be no knowledge? So that in truth the received doctrine of the Schools being thorowly examined, the contrary will appear the more reasonable of the two: and that we must rather first of all acknowledge a Divine Power precedent and effecting this extraordinary stupendious work, before we may call it a Miracle; than first admit this to be a Miracle; and then, and thence infer a Divine Power. So that it seems very difficult and dubious to make scientificall conclusions of any thing divine: And that after all, there may be sufficient presumptions to render a thing credible without lightness and rashness, yet the Arguments perswading shall not be so pressing and cogent, but due place should remain for a Faith, or assent, which may not be properly humane and natural, (which it must needs be, if it proceeded simply from sense or reason natural) but divine; and an admirable temperament be found in that we call The true Christian Faith; wherein the Grace of God inwardly moving and inclining the Will to embrace that, to which it might notwithstanding all reasons to the contrary, not altogether unreasonably have dissented; and yet with reason doth assent: the Grace of God *pulling down strong holds, casting down imaginations, and every high thing that exalteth it self against the knowledge of God, and bringing into Captivity every thought, unto the obedience of Christ.* As St. Paul excellently saith, speaking of the carnal warfare of humane ratiocinations, either for, or against Divine Faith and Doctrine; which have no might but through God, as he suffers by his justice the reasonings and eloquence of men to take place against his doctrine, or to prevail towards the receiving of the truth, by the superadded Power of his Holy Spirit: as to this end St. Paul speaks in his first Epistle to the Corinthians, thus, *And my speech, and my preaching was not with enticing words of mans wisdom, but in demonstration of the Spirit and of*

2 Cor. 10. 4, 5.

1 Cor. 2. 4, 5.

*Power, That your Faith should not stand in the wisdom of men, but in the power of God.* Signifying unto us, that the power of God is no more than necessary to concur with humane reason to the heightning it to such great effects: though the Grace of God be all sufficient of it self to produce such effects; without, yea contrary to such reasons as humane Philosophy or Eloquence can minister to a man. And this I have held not unnecessary to be premised to this great difficulty of asserting and evidencing the Scriptures to be the word of God, as well ingenuously to profess, there appear no such convincing reasons to prove the same, as some make shew of, and promise; as to discover the error of such who would have Christian Religion to stand upon humane Faith. For if Christian Faith be built upon the Scripture, (as is most undeniable) and the assurance we have that the Scriptures are the word of God, can be absolutely wrought by outward reasons, (which cannot be drawn from the Scriptures, being supposed, at present, under question) certainly all our Faith must hang upon the veracity and certainty of such Reasons. Therefore must this middle way be chosen to acknowledg such prerogatives, even of outward reason, preparing and disposing mens hearts, that no other Religion or writing can lay any tolerable claim to; and yet such as shall stand in need of a divine concurrence to perfect the same, to the nature of a truly divine and Christian assent and Faith. Now the foresaid preparatory and justly inclining motives may be these following, peculiar to the Scriptures. The first thing then which must be supposed in this case, is, that which all Religions, and even common Reason require, that it is the will of God that some of mankind should be saved, that is, become blessed and happy after this Life is ended, in heaven: But this cannot be supposed without due obedience and worship given unto that great and bountiful Creatour and Saviour: and this Obedience or worship cannot be given unto God, in a manner acceptable to him, unless this manner be first of all known unto man: and this cannot be known, unless God teaches him that knowledge. And this teaching of him must either be by inward, or outward Revelation; Inward Revelation is the natural endowment of the understanding given by God unto Man, enabling him to judge of things: and this all People equally share in, (not that there is a necessary equality, or so much as disposition to knowledge in all men, but that no order of People are denied this benefit; which some persons stir up and improve to a more high and excellent degree of knowledge) yet not so, but we see many persons, and almost people so degenerate as not to perceive those things which conduce necessarily to the ends of common humanity and civility. Therefore God at first in creating of man, purposely instituted him least the greatest part of his own workmanship, and that by his own intention, should miscarrie in the due ends of being; or the defects of him originally redound on himself. To determine this more accurately, is the office of some other place: only this may suffice here to note, that man apparently being defective in this so necessary a point, standeth in need of some supply to perfect him in it; divine inward Revelation failing him generally, even in matters of an inferiour nature to devine worship. Wherefore, that his will be cleared and revealed outwardly, which inwardly is obscured and corrupted, is necessary to the foresaid ends: And therefore that the Word of God, which is received by Christians as proceeding from him, and a Declaration of his Will to mankind, is to be made appear so far, as it may be credible to an indifferent and unprejudicate mind: and serve the ends for which it was ordained

vid Thomam.  
l. 1<sup>a</sup>. q. 1. 1<sup>a</sup>.  
cor.



ordained of God, viz. Instruction of man in the mind and will of God, and leading him unto eternal happiness.

## CHAP. VIII.

*More special proofs of the truth of Christian Religion; and more particularly from the Scriptures being the Word of God, which is proved by several Reasons.*

**I**T coming to the same end, to prove the Scriptures to be the Word of God, and the Religion built upon them to be of God; we shall here endeavour to give farther evidence of both together, in this order.

First, If the Scriptures and Christian Religion have been preserved and asserted by God himself, it is plain that they proceed originally from God. For as the Scripture telleth us (not without the assent of rational men) *Whatsoever plant God hath not planted, shall be rooted out.* Mat. 15. 13. But God hath specially and wonderfully owned and maintained the Doctrine of the Scriptures, therefore by his appointment, were they ordained. For it is a Rule in Natural Philosophy, which holds no less true in Supernatural; *We are nourished and conserved by those things of which we consist.* Neither is it probable, that God should give any direct countenance to that as Divine, which is forged and counterfeit. But we see that whereas many eminent and Learned mens Works highly approved and applauded, have perished, the Holy Scriptures have been preserved entire.

And this attestation of God to them hath been more apparent in the concomitant Acts and Miracles wrought by Christ, the immediate Author of them, and his Apostles and Servants under him. Christ saith expressly, *My Doctrine is not mine, but his that sent me.* This he thus proves elsewhere, *The works that I do in my Fathers name, they bear witness of me.* And again, *Believe me for the very works sake.* And again, *If I do not the works of my Father believe me not.* Joh. 7. 16.  
Joh. 10. 25.  
Joh. 14. 11.  
Joh. 10. 37. From all which fair dealing, it appears that Christ intended not to impose a groundless, and reasonless Faith upon the world, but to commend such an one as had such competent demonstrations, as that subject was capable of, or the like Moral things. Now, that such miracles were wrought by Christ, and that not by sleight of hand, after the manner of cunning Impostours, the Effects themselves in himself, and which is much more, his Followers and Servants in his name, is matter of Credit as much as any thing delivered unto us in humane Histories. Besides, Christs Apostles professed they delivered nothing but from God and Christ to us: and this they prosecuted with many and great difficulties, dangers, distresses, and generally with the loss of their very blood, cheerfully poured out, and their lives prodigally spent in that testimonie, that no men of reason or common sense would have gone through so much dry service, but upon a divine impulse and assurance of the truth they delivered an expectation

tion of an everlasting reward for it.

Here therefore both Jews and Gentiles enter their Caveat, and affirm, That what Christ did, was by indirect means of Evil Spirits: Some Jews specially traducing him with abusing the Sacred name of God privily born about him to that purpose. The Heathens have compared to him *Apollonius, Tyaneus*; and *Jannes and Jambres*, withstanding *Moses* before *Pharaoh*; being all notorious Magicians. But these have received answer from most of the ancient and Learned Fathers, who have met with this Exception and to this purpose answered. First, that it is not true, that they ever wrought such miracles as did Christ, and his Servants. Secondly, the wonders they wrought were not done with such simplicity and perspicuity as the other were. Christ and his Apostles only by the word of their mouths commanded the winds and seas, and cured the sick, opened the eyes of the blind, gave straitness and strength to the Lamé and Creepled; whereas Magicians are constrained to use many horrible and ridiculous Rites to the inducing of Evil Spirits to act for them. Thirdly, The end of this doctrine and Miracles mutually justifie one another, as to the divineness of them. For, most or all Magical wonders were wrought to ends agreeable to such Evil Spirits as set them on work, viz. For Couzenage, for Lust, for wantonness, for malice, for revenge, and such like unreasonable passions. But the ends both of the Christian doctrine and Miracles, were no other then Temperance, Continence, Patience, Meekness, Charity, and the compleat exercise of all such Virtues as nature it self approved and magnified: And declared openly to be done against vain-glory, and Licentiousness, and in opposition and confusion of such wicked Spirits as abused mankind generally before Christ's coming in the Flesh. And as Christ argues strongly, How can Satan cast out Satan? How could he give any countenance or aid to them that ejected and dispossessed and confounded him? yea made him pronounce his own unhappiness, and inability to resist the Divine vertue in Christs servants by Exorcisms tormenting him; as the ancient Fathers frequently assure us: telling us how they openly challenged them to stand it out with them. Now these things were effected by the Word of God. Which insinuates,

A Third ground of the Divineness of the Scripture and Christianity also, viz. The nature of the Doctrine, whose simplicity, Majesty, Puritie, Humility and Sublimity are such as will admit of no Competitors. It is written of *Mahomet* indeed, That having patched up his Alcoran, he openly boasted and brag'd what he had done and challenged those pitiful, ignorant, and stupid people, to shew any man that could compose such another piece. But it is certain that himself was so altogether illiterate and ignorant, and so continued, that he could neither write nor read, but caused it to be set together by better Wits but no better hearts then his: And the very vain-glory discovered sufficiently the imposture. But such was the doctrine of our Saviour and his Apostles; that, so far as any thing can prove it self from its native truth and Excellencie, this did manifest it self to the world, and captivated more with its plain dealing than ever any of the most profound Philosophers works, or the Eloquence of humane Orators. Which yet further appears from,

A Fourth head, viz. The incapacity and infirmities of the Chiefest Agents under God, in inditing and framing the same, which amazed the Elders of the Jews themselves hearing *Peter* and *John* deliver such wonderful doctrine, accompanied with such marvellous works, until they resolve themselves

Arnob. cont.  
Gentes.  
Aug. de Civit.  
Dei. lib. 1.  
Euseb. De-  
monst. Evang.  
lib. 3. c. 3. & 8.  
Ire.

Tertul. Apol.  
cap. 23.  
Lactan. 8. In-  
stitut. cap. 27.  
Hieron. ad  
Marcel. ep. 17.  
Πᾶσι μὲν μα-  
γεία παύεται,  
πᾶσι μὲν φαρ-  
μακία κατάρ-  
γεται, ὅτι πάν-  
τα μὲν ἡ δόξα  
ἐρμηνεύται, ὅτι  
κατὰ ἡμᾶς ἐπα-  
νέ-  
ται, πᾶσα δὲ  
ἀλογία ἡ δόξα  
παύεται, &c.  
Athan. de  
Incarnat.  
Hotting. Hist.  
Orient. lib. 2.

Acts. 4. 13.

selves in the reason of it, considering that they had been with Jesus: who had taught and enabled them, being but simple unlearned and ignorant men of themselves, so to speak and act. And the like may be said of the rest of the Apostles: who likewise having been with Jesus, and afterward more amply furnished with the Holy Spirit on the day of Pentecost, spake the wonderful works of God, to the Admiration of all their Auditors. Which maketh St. *Chrysostome* in several places to triumph over all other Doctors, in their behalf speaking to this purpose. *Where are now your grave and learned Philosophers, with their affected habits, their long beards, their solemn gate?* Where are your Eloquent Orators? A Poor Tent-maker, as was *Paul*: An ignorant Fisherman, as was *Peter*, and the rest of the simple Apostles, have carried the world from them all; have drawn all Nations after them. Can this proceed from any but a Divine power?

Chrysostom.  
Tom. 2. pag.  
56c. H. Tom.  
4. pag. 611.

And Fifthly, could it be ascribed to any thing but a Divine power, That so many wise, so many learned, so many noble, so many rich, so many young and old Virgins, tender and delicate, should so humbly and devoutly embrace, so stoutly and hardily maintain with the loss of their lives, and relations, and fortunes, such a doctrine as brought them no Credit, no profit, no pleasure, but rigours and Severities, and self denials, but by Divine inspirations? How many hath *Mahomet's* Religion won unto it, for so many hundred years, besides those who have either by early education, sucked in those corrupt Principles, or by Terroure and Power over them, have been constrained to it? or corrupted by the flatteries of Licentiousness and Pleasure countenanced by it? Alas! so few that they are not worth the reckoning up.

Sixthly, The admirable harmony between these diverse Authors far distant in place, at the time of their composing Holy writ, with themselves, and also with the Ancient Prophets before Christ, insinuating the same things they, at Christs coming, explain'd and published; is no small argument of Gods finger in the work. Which are *Tertullians* two reasons given against *Marcion*: who blasphemously affirmed, One God to be the Author of the Old Testament, and another of the New.

Tertul. Ad-  
ver. Marc. lib.  
3. cap. 5.

Seventhly, consider we the manner of propagating this word of God, and worship: that, as is already intimated, was not only by weak and illiterate Instruments: but altogether in a meek, peaceable, and gentle perswasive, not coercive way, by civil fore or violence; but less towards such as once having freely given their names to God, and were incorporated with them, proved false and made defection from them. Though it hath appeared, that the vengeance of God hath wonderfully pursued the Persecutors of his faithful Servants.

Ὅτι τὸ θεῖον  
λόγος ὁ πᾶσι  
διδοῦναι τὴν  
χαρίαν τοῦ  
ἐκείνου διδόν-  
τος, τὸς πάν-  
τας ἐπισκο-  
ποῦν, καὶ μὴ  
ἐκείνων διδόν-  
τας χάριν κατὰ  
τοὺς πάντας  
ἐκείνων ἐκεί-  
νου, καὶ ὅτι  
ἐκείνου ἐκεί-  
νης πᾶσι  
καὶ Ἀθαν. de  
Incar nat.

Lastly, (aiming at brevity) It is a notable argument of its Native Excellency and Perfection, That all the greatest Wits of the world being bent against the Word of God, and endeavouring to pick holes in it, and convict it of error, have failed in such their attempts; and have rather rendr'd it more undoubted and conspicuous. Whereas no sooner are other Pretending writings brought to due light and examination, but they are convicted of impostures.



## CHAP. IX.

*Of the several Senses and Meanings according to which the Scriptures may be understood.*

**I**T being found what is the Letter of the Word of God: It is necessary to know, what is the true sense of it: For this is only in truth, the Word, and not the Letters, Syllables, or Grammatical words. To know this, we must first distinguish a Sense Historical and Mystical.

The Historical Sense is the same as the Literal; so called because it is that which is primarily signified and intended by such a form of words. And this is twofold. For either these words are to be taken in the proper and natural signification (as I may call that which is in most vulgar use) or in their borrowed and metaphorical Sense. As when I call a thing *hard*, and apply it to Iron, or Stone; I speak properly; and according to the Natural sense: but when I apply *Hardness* to the heart, I speak improperly and Metaphorically, and yet Literally too, intending thereby to signify not any natural, but moral quality in the heart. The *Seven Ears*, (saith Joseph in Genesis) *are seven years*, and the *Seven fat Kine* are *Seven years*. And so Christ in the Gospel, *This is my Body*; and infinite others in Scripture, are Metaphorical and Literal Senses both.

The Mystical Sense is that which is a translation, not so much of words from one signification to another; as of the entire Sense to a meaning not excluding the Historical or Literal Sense, but built upon it, and occasion'd by it. And is commonly divided into the Tropological, Allegorical, and Anagogical: which some (as Origen) make coordinate with the former, saying, *The Scripture is a certain Intelligible world: wherein are four Parts, as four Elements. The Earth is the Literal Sense. The waters is the profound Moral Sense. The Air is the Natural Sense, or natural science therein found. And above all, the sublime sense, which is Fire.* In another place he mentions only, the Historical, Moral, and Mystical: And generally the Fathers do acknowledg all these, though with some variation, not distinguishing them, as we have; as might be shown, were it needful to enlarge here, on that subject. The Moral Sense is that which is drawn from the natural, to signify the manners and conditions of men. The Allegorical is a sense under a continuation of tropes, and figures. The Anagogical, a translation of the meaning of things, said or done on earth, to things proper to heaven. The Oxe being suffered to eat, while he trod out the Corn; according to St. Paul, in the Moral sense, signified that the labourer was worthy of his hire. Mount Sinah and Mount Sion (as the same Apostle saith) signified the two Cities of God, Earthly and Heavenly, Allegorically. And the Church of God upon Earth, the Church Triumphant in heaven. It is therefore without reason and modesty both, that some strickt Modern Divines have set themselves against the Antient, in contracting all these senses into one, so as to allow no more: which is of very ill consequence to the Faith both of Jew and Christian. For generally all the hopes of the Jews concerning the Messias to come: and all

the

Origen. Homil. 2. In Diversos.

Idem. Homil. 5. in Leviticum.

Gal. 2.24, 25.

the proofs of the Christian taken from the Old Testament, That he is come, would come to little or nothing, seeing there is manifestly a Literal or Historical sense primarily intended; upon which the Mystical is built. So that the arguments of the Evangelists, and *St. Paul* in his Epistles convincing that Christ was the true Messiah, must needs be invalid, seeing their quotation to that purpose had certainly another Literal Sense. And it is against the condition of the whole Law it self; which, as *St. Paul* Heb. 10. 1. saith, was a Shadow of good things to come, and not the very things themselves.

It is here replied commonly; That all these are but one Literal Perkins on Gal. 22. sense, diversely expressed: which is to grant all that is contended for; but with a reservation of a peculiar way of speaking, to themselves; that having been so unfortunate as to judge of things amiss, they may in some manner solace themselves with variety of phrase; too commonly found amongst such as resolve to say something new, where there is no just cause at all.

And to that which seems a Difficultie. That no Symbolical sense can be argumentative or prove any thing in Divinity; we answer, That it cannot indeed, unless it be known first to be the true Mystical sense of the words alleged; For neither is the Literal sense it self, until it be known that such was the true intent of the Speaker. But those things which were symbolically and Mystically delivered in the Law, being well known to Christ and his Apostles, as likewise to the Learnedest of the Jewish Doctors by a received current tradition amongst them, were of force to the ends alleged by them. But where such a Mystical sense is not received, nothing can be inferred from thence, which is conclusive.

## C H A P. X.

*Of the true Interpretation of Holy Scriptures.  
The true meaning, not the letter, properly,  
Scripture. Of the difficultie of attaining the  
proper sense, and the Reasons thereof.*

**I**T availeth a Christian as little to have the Letter of the word of God without the genuine sense, as it doth a man to have the shell without the Kernel. For the sense is the word of God, not the Letter. Wicked men, yea the Devil himselfe maketh use of the Letter to contradict the truth it self, as *St. Hierome* hath observed, and other Fathers, and constant experience certifieth not without the consent of the Scripture it self, which saith of it self, *In it are some things hard to be understood, which they, that are unlearned and unstable, wrest, as they do all other Scriptures, to their own destruction.* 2 Pet. 3. 16. Therefore, because it is very necessarie to be informed of the difficulties and dangers in misinterpreting Scripture, before we can thoroughly apply our selves to prevent and avoid them, we will First shew briefly, That many things are difficult in Scripture, and the Reasons why: and after proceed to the most probable means rightly to interpret the same.

E

And

And these obstacles in attaining the true sense of Gods word, are either found in our selves or in Gods wisdom and Providence; or lastly in the Word of God itself. Some indeed piously but inconsiderately make all the reason of difficulties (not denied by them altogether) in the Scripture, to be in Man: supposing they hereby vindicate Gods Providence from that censure it might otherwise be liable unto, if so be that God should deliver such a Law to man which could not well be understood, but apt to mislead men into error: And therefore, say they, It is the darkness, and perverseness of mans understanding and will, that make things in Scripture obscure, and not the condition of the Scriptures themselves. But this no ways doth attain its end. For when did God deliver his written word unto Mankind? In his state of innocencie and perfection, or imperfection and blindness of mind? God certainly knew that man was frail, and apt to mistake, when he delivered his Law: How then is this an Apologie sufficient for him, who gave such a Law, as was disproportionable to his understanding at the time of giving it? But then secondly, considering that the understanding, and the thing to be understood are *Relatives*; and that it comes to the same end, whether the Facultie be unapt to conceive, or the Object unapt to be conceived; such an excuse is to no purpose. But yet withal we must note that man is not to be excused from guilt in misunderstanding. First, because he willingly brought this defect upon himself by his Original Bility and Fall: and Secondly, Because he, through vile and vicious affections doth oftentimes contract a greater darkness and disorder than is natural to him, even in this state of Original sin. And God, as all other Law-givers, did not proportion the Law given, according to the contingent dispositions of particular mens understanding, but according to that common *Scantling* found generally in Man: So that undoubtedly some men are the proper authors of their own ignorance in divine matters, through their affected evil manners: as the Scripture, and the Fathers jointly shew.

A second General reason is from God. 1. Calling man to the knowledge of himself, and that by his word; and never intending to alter the course of nature, and general state of man in this life, which was, and is, to be fallible (Infalibilitie being the portion of the blessed in the life to come;) It were not impossible that God should either by so framing his word, or so refraining man, have secured him from erring about it, but he hath not so done: neither doth it appear, how such Exemptions and priviledges could consist with his Providence more general. For,

Secondly, The Providence of God having determined to preserve humane and divine Societies, as he had constituted; this can hardly be understood to be more readily and safely effected than by mutual obligations, and a necessity of mutual offices to be done one towards another. And the first thing conducing hereunto, is, the Order of Governors and Governed, of Masters and Scholars; of such as teach, and such as are taught in the Word. But if every man were wise in the Laws of man, had the power of the Sword justly given into his own hands, or the power of the Word in his own breast, then would there be no need at all of Rulers or teachers to teach or instruct; or reprove and redress errors in manners: because, Every man is supposed to be an independent Prince: and though he should offend against nature it self, was not to be punished by one who had no authority over him. Hence therefore it is, that God most wisely hath suffered an inequality of Persons in all Ages, all Faculties, all Policies, as well divine



divine as humane, that the more strickt the bond is, the more intire the soci-  
etic and unity might also be.

Thirdly, As this discrimination secures the necessary relations between  
men within themselves, so doth it the dependance between God and Man,  
which must never be forgotten. For, as for the Father to deliver all the  
writings of his Estate to his son, and to put him in present and full pos-  
session of all his wealth, is the next way to tempt his son to forget and dis-  
respect him and no more to acknowledg any duty to him; in like manner,  
were it so that God, at once, should have put man in ample and absolute  
knowledg of his holy writings and will, without reserving to himself the  
farther manifestation of difficult matters, there would be no address to  
God, no worship, no seeking to him for satisfaction and information in the  
Care of his Soul. One main end and office of prayer would be extinct.  
So we read that God designing the Law to the Israelites, provided afore-  
hand, That the ordinary Rulers should judg the people at all time; but the  
hard causes, they should bring to *Moses*; and *Moses* himself, cases too  
hard for him, to God: As in the Case of him that gathered sticks on the Sab-  
bath day, and of *Zelophehads* daughters.

Fourthly, God suffers this, to the end he might quicken, and excite our  
Endeavours and industry in the search after his holy will so reveiled unto  
us. For, were it so that all things were presently and readily obvious un-  
to us, there would be wanting that excellent vertue of labour, to which  
God hath ordained all men since the fall; to perserve them from greater  
mischiefs incident to weak man. And besides, contempt and slighting are  
allwaies the consequent of what is plain and familiar to us. And there-  
fore, that argument which some use to prove all things evident in Scrip-  
ture, and others contrariwise, that all things are unquestionable in the  
Church, so that according to the opinion of the one, a man committing  
himself to the holy Scriptures, and according to the other, submitting him-  
self to the Church, in all things, he may promise himself security, rather than  
safety, do make more against this; It being more certainly the Will of God,  
(while we war in the Church militant) we should never rest secure from due  
solicitudes, and temptations; but by often contentions with him to pre-  
serve our selves from falling from the true Faith, or falling into a false  
Faith.

A third General reason of the obscurities in Scripture may be taken from  
the Scriptures themselves: which not compared with the general ability of  
mans reason and understanding only, but with other writings also, are of  
difficult access: and that will be thought no calumnie, if it be considered,  
First, That the languages in which they were originally written are so far  
perished now adayes, that they are familiar to no nation, neither can the  
many Idioms and proprieties of the phrase be well understood by us. Sec-  
ondly, The Histories thereof, and the several customes, rites, Civil and Re-  
ligious, amongst the Heathens, as well as Jews and Christians; the habits,  
gestures and acts, very easily known and readily apprehended by such as  
lived in those dayes and places, are now hardly to be understood. Third-  
ly, The difficulty of distinguishing between Canonical and Uncanonical  
Writings. Fourthly, The subtilty and artifices of Heretiques, in their  
corrupting, if not the Letter, yet perverting the genuine sense: Yea, the  
very Orthodox Expositors are themselves so various and unconsenting in  
the true meaning, that they much more distract and unsettle, than guide or  
promote men in the knowledge of Scripture it self; which naked would

Besides those  
Texts of  
Scripture,  
which by rea-  
son of wif-  
dom and  
depth of  
sense, and my-  
stery laid up  
in them, are  
not yet con-  
ceived; there  
are in Scrip-  
ture of things  
that are *εὐσεβία*  
and *πρότυπα*  
seemingly  
confused,  
*ἐναντιοπαρῶν*  
carrying sem-  
blance of  
Contrariety  
and Achro-  
nisms, Meta-  
chronisms,  
and the like,  
which brings  
infinite ob-  
scurity to the  
text. There  
are I say,  
more of them  
in Scripture  
then in any  
writer that I  
know secular  
or divine.  
*Dr. Hales*  
Serm. 1. p. 22.

be better understood and resolved on, then with them. Fifthly, The seeming opposition and contradiction in Scripture, are no little impediments to the settling of mens minds in the knowledg of them. Sixthly, a Sixth difficulty will be, The distinguishing of things Judicial, Ceremonial and Moral, so far as to be assured, How far it is lawful to use, or necessary to refuse, what is prescribed by Precept, or example in the Old Testament. Seventhly, To name no more; The several various Lections may much offend the simplicity of such, who shall not be well inform'd concerning the substantial integrity of Divine writ. And all these I recite to no other end, than to slacken the precipitancy, and cool the impetuous and presumptuous heat of such, who, the less able they are to examine and judge, the more confident they are to conclude out of Scriptures, what they phantasie and like best: refusing the outward and ordinary means of receiving the true sense, upon indeed a certain truth, That Gods Spirit is the best interpreter of its own Laws; and God is able to direct them in the sober use of them; but a most unsound and unsafe inference from hence, that God doth, or will so assist them, when they neglect those sober outward means he hath no less ordained to that end then the former. Of which means we are in the next place here to treat.

## CHAP. XI.

*Of the Means of interpreting the Scripture.  
That they who understand Scripture are not,  
for that, authorized to Interpret it decisively.  
The Spirit not a Proper Judge of the Scrip-  
tures sense. Reason no Judge of Scripture.  
There is no Infallible Judge of Scripture,  
nor no necessity of it absolute. The grounds  
of an Infallible Judge examined.*

**T**HE Opinion, That all things necessary to salvation are plainly enough delivered in Scripture, is pious, and reasonable enough, taken with its due qualifications and limitations; namely, of Persons, of Times, of Places, and such like. For of things supposed to be necessary, all are not to all men alike necessary, no not to the same man, at all times. For there are some Articles of Faith that are sufficiently explained and propounded to him, others are not so; and therefore in relation to such a person, not so necessary to be explicitly believed. Again, some points of Religion are necessary to be received for their own sakes, after due proposal, others are necessary to be received for the sake of others; and so immediately only necessary. The Articles in the Creed of the Apostles are most of the former sort, to be, for their own sakes, believed: But the Articles of the Church

Church, and its power, and authority, (which I take not to be mentioned in the Creed as most do) are necessary for the preservation of the true Faith it self: For without the use and receiving of Discipline, there can be no Church properly so called (as may hereafter be proved) and without a Church there can be no long continuance of Faith. Therefore, from hence it is not difficult to null the pretensions of some ranck Disputants, who lay it as a Principal foundation, and so reasonable, that it scarce needs any thing but clamours and outcries to make it take effect on them that shall dare to reject it, That nothing is necessarily to be offered to the Faith of any, or to be by him received, which is not expressed in holy writ. For in holy writ, it is necessary to observe and obey such as are set over us in the Lord, so far as we are not convinced, that they determine or impose any thing contrary to the word of God. And for ought doth appear, it is as necessarily required that we should depend upon our Guides in the Church for the due meaning of the Scriptures, as upon the suggestions of Gods Spirit which refuseth not, but requireth such outward means concurring with its direction. For nothing can be more absurd or vain than simply to depend upon divine intimations of Gods Spirit, because it is all-sufficient, of it self, to such purposes. For it is not only sufficient to them, but to all other, as well divine as natural ends; and yet to so rest on it as to neglect or pass over contemptuously other means, is rather to provoke God to deny the ordinary assistance of it. For God doth not act in the world according to his power, but according to his Will and Promise made unto us. It is true, that Christ hath promised in St. *Matthew*, *Whatsoever ye ask in my name believing, ye shall receive*; and by St. *Luke* more expressly, *If ye then being evil know how to give good gifts unto your children, how much more shall your heavenly Father give the holy Spirit to them that ask him*. These, and such like promises of being invested with Gods blessed Spirit, must not be so absolutely understood, as that all who simply crave it, should forthwith certainly be therewith endowed; because St. *James* (as other places of Scripture) explains and restrains this large promise, according to the Oeconomie, or more general tenour of the Gospel, *i.e. That we ask aright, and believing*, which whether we in prayer do duly observe, may be well doubted of us; though we doubt not of the *Thesis* it self, or Rule, That he that asketh aright shall receive.

Math. 21. 22.

Luk. 11. 13.

And besides, these are senses in which such promises are truly verified, and Gods Spirit truly given, and yet not a full importment of all the graces which flow from it. For they, who at first were called to the Faith of Christ, and baptized, were indued with the holy Spirit, and yet not presently instated in the discerning of all the mysteries of Christian Faith, but still depended upon the Prophets and Apostles, and interpreters of Gods will, for the attaining of his will even revealed in General. For according to the known distinction, there are spiritual Gifts signally so called, and spiritual Graces. And some men may receive the influence of Gods Spirit in the way of Grace, which sanctifies the will and affections, and not of Gifts, which illuminates the mind and understanding; and that not only to the use of things absolutely necessary to our Salvation, but to the benefit of others.

Add hereunto, That notwithstanding the Spirit is so sufficient of it self, and God doth grant it to them who ask it of them; We know that generally it is not granted to any, but in the way which Christ ordained the same,



same; and that was, that first, it should descend (as it also did) immediately and primarily upon the Church representative, or Ruling; who were then his Apostles and holy Disciples; and in like manner is it still to be expected soberly, through the mediation of such as are by Christ set to govern the Church, and rule under him, herein succeeding the Apostles; and not immediately, and by a leap from the head to the lowest members: which though it may be, yet is so rarely, that none can without another extraordinary confirmation, rest satisfied that so it is really with him.

Lastly, for our clearer proceeding, We are herein to distinguish between the attaining to the true sense of Scripture, and the decision or determination of Controversies according to the Scripture. And that the most important Query is not so much, Whether a man hath the Spirit, or not, or whether he hath the truest and most genuine meaning of the Spirit speaking in the Scriptures, or not; but how this should be made known and manifested so far unto others, as that they should rationally and soberly rest satisfied in the opinions of the said pretenders to such truths. For, its well and finally said in this doubt, The Question is not, Whether the Spirit in a Man or Church, or the Scripture, (though this last way is very improperly expressed) be the best Judge of the Sense of Scripture; but where it resides, to such purposes? And what a great stir is made to little purpose, while the former is so easily granted on all sides, and there is nothing done at all to convince a sober man or Christian, That such or such persons are they we ought expect the dictates of Gods Spirit from. For, Judgement, properly so called, can never be separated from Authority, or lawful presiding over others, joyned with power to oblige to such sentence as shall be passed: but how this should be competent to single, or many Persons agreeing in the same thing, in their private capacity; yea though enabled with the Spirit more than ordinary, cannot well be understood. So that at most, they can be judges of controversies only for themselves, and that at their own peril; and can do no more than persuade, advise, and exhort, not oblige others to think as they do: But Judges must, and ought to do more, or they had as good do nothing. So that, that which hath found great acceptance and applause by too many, doth upon examination prove very insignificant and impertinent to the resolution of the difficultie in hand, *viz.* That things that are necessary are obvious in Scripture, and, Every man is Judge to himself: granting; I say, This; (which is yet really untrue) yet scarce any thing is said to the purpose; which enquired not so much, How a man might persuade *himself*, but how, and with what influence he may proceed to the conviction and reducing of *others*; so that the *essential* to a Church be not destroyed, as it certainly must be, where no communion is; and there will infallibly cease all communion where it is merely arbitrary for Christians to believe and judge and walk and worship as they please. For, this it is for every man to judge for himself. Will it be yet farther said, That we should bear with one another, and live peaceably and charitably one with another, and not molest each other for his Judgement; If it be, as I know it is; I reply first, That this plausibility, without possibility, is not true according to the opinions of them who use it. For they certainly hold, That Heresie and Schism are not to be endured or born withal. Christ and God must not be blasphemed by unsound opinions, or prophane or superstitious actions: and this diversity, yea, contrariety of judging, must needs find these faults in one  
another

another, very often; and consequently, be of opinion, That they are not to be suffered; and Charity must not be so far mistaken or abused, as to licentiate such enormities.

But, What if after all this contention for the Spirit, it be not judge at all, as in truth it is not, in any proper sense? For, the Spirit is only the due qualification of the Person, or Persons, not simply to judge (for that descends upon them by being ordinarily, and orderly constituted over the Church of Christ) but to judge aright; and to give faithful and unerring sentence in matters under debate and question.

And the same may be, in proportion, affirmed of Reason termed by some, who would seem to excell others in reason, most improperly, as well as unreasonably, Judge of Controversies; For all judgement, disquisition, and expositions, are made by Persons, not by things. Reason indeed is the Instrument whereby a Person is enabled to judge, or find out the truth; unto which unless there be a due accession of Authority and Power, such reason, though very exquisite and happy, must keep within its own doors, and judge at home for it self, and not for others: nor contrary to more publick and authoritative determinations, without the peril of being taxed of Arrogance, and it self justly condemned, if not for the inward errors of the mind, for the outward errors in ill managing truths.

If it were so, That Reason in men were infallible, we ought not to stand upon niceties of terms, or improper language. But for men to deny others the *Seat* and Power of Judicature, because they may err; and to take it to themselves, as if the spirit of Error had no power over them, is at the same time a grievous, though pleasing error, both against Reason and common justice too.

And if it be said, That every man is bound by the Law of nature, being indued with reason, to use that reason, and not brutishly to suffer himself, he knows not or cares not whether, to be carried by others Reasons, and not his own: I retort, And every man is obliged by the Law of Nations, which is a more refined principle than that of gross Nature properly taken, to contain himself in the order of Community he is placed, and to submit to the reason of common Judgement, no less than his own. For, undoubtedly, until every man in private and particular, be unerrable (which is not to be expected on this side heaven) there will diverse inconsistent judgements prevail, and divide one from another; and cause such a breach as the society, whether divine or humane, will soon perish, and come to nothing. But granting what was before demanded, That every man must act according to his reason above the nature of beasts; this doth not conclude, That therefore he must be let alone; and not brought, even by force, to submit to others, against such reason. First, Because it is not resolved by any but a mans own deceitful opinion, That it is really reason which is so presumed to be. Secondly, Because he that is so constrained to submit his reason, is not thereby denied either the nature or use of his; but still much transcendeth the capacity of beasts: For, He discusses, he discourses, he judges rationally, after the manner of men; even when the effect of all these Acts are contrary to reason. And lastly, In wise men, and good humble Christians, there is a superior principal of reasonableness to that of meer direct nature: For, That he that has most reason on his side and (when that it self is controverted) he that according to appearance of Circumstances, may lay the fairest claim to that, is to be followed, no rational man can deny. Therefore, should a Mans private

vate reason perswade him, That he hath found out the truth, and yet at the same time assure him, That he is no less fallible than another man; and therefore may possibly embrace and hug a false conception with as much fondness as a true; and withal, That private Judgements are not in themselves so safe as publique, nor single, as many. What violence were this to his reason, nay, how much more rational than the first simple Act, to comply with the Reason of others, whom reason also requires to listen to and obey; and Scripture much more?

From hence we may rightly conclude against both extremes in these days, who yet agree in this very ill-grounded opinion, That there must be an Infallible Director or Judge, or we cannot submit to them, in matters of Faith and our Salvation. This is absolutely untrue, both in humane and divine matters. Who sees not indeed that it were to be wished for, and above all things desired? Who sees not the great inconvenience for want of such a standard of opinions as this? But can we rationally conclude therefore, that so it is? Or hath God, or ought he, of his necessary goodness and wisdom (as some have ventured to affirm) to grant all things, that are infallibly good for man? Is it not sufficient, that a fair, (though not infallible) way is opened to attain the truth here, and bliss hereafter; but every one must find it? Is it little or no absurditie, That infinite never come to means of truth, and so great, that many who enjoy them, do not receive the benefit by them.

Again, Are good manners and virtues no less essential to Salvation than Faith? and is there no infallible Judge of manners? Is there no infallible Casuist? And must there be of points of Faith? How many have the infallible Rule of holy Life, and yet mistake either in the sense or application of it, so far as to perish in unknown Sins? And yet none have, to prevent that great and common evil, call'd for an infallible Censour, whose determinations might settle doubtful consciences in greatest safety, and silence all apologies which are wont to be made for our sins and errors, and so bring us necessarily to truth or leave us under self and affected condemnation.

But, The Ground of this mistake being farther searched into, will be found very weak and fallacious. *An infallible Faith* (say they) *must have an infallible Judge*: And of these some assume thus. *There is no man infallible; Therefore no man can be Judge of Faith*: Others assume thus. *But there is, and must be an infallible Faith; Therefore, there must be an infallible Judge*. So that we see, both would have infallible Judges; but differ only in their choice of them. For, The former would have the Scriptures Judge and Rule, which is very honest; but very simple. The later would have some external Judge; which hath much more of reason in it: And fails only in the choice of this Judge, or in the description of him. For, There is nothing more unreasonable than to ordain that which is under debate to be Judge of it self; besides the great absurdity of confounding the Rule or Law; and the Interpreter and Judge. And, There is nothing more fallacious than to confound Causes and occasions together; as the later opinion doth. For, If the Church, or whatever Judge may be supposed, were the true direct cause of our Faith; then indeed it would necessarily follow; That our Faith could no wayes be infallible, unless the Judge were also infallible; the effect not exceeding the cause, nor the Conclusion the Premises or propositions from whence it was deduced: But, Because the Church is only an Occasion, or a Cause without which we should



should neither believe the Scriptures in general to be the Word of God, nor any sentence to be duly drawn from the same, there is no necessity at all of such a consequence. For, The Infallibility now spoken of, is either the thing believed, which is the Word of God, of which the Church, I hope, is no Cause, or the Grace of Faith excited and exercised by us through the Spirit of Grace in us: the ministry of the Church serving thereunto: according to St. Paul saying, *We therefore as workers together with him, beseech you also, that ye receive not the grace of God in vain.* 2 Cor. 6. 1.

For, as in things natural, He that applies Actives to Passives, that is, the Cause proper, to the matter about which the Action is, is not the proper or natural cause of the Effect, but the occasion only: yet is said vulgarly, so to be; as when a man applies fire to combustible matter, he may (though improperly) be said to burn it, when it is the fire, and not he, that burns it: So the Church or Judge of Scriptures sense applying the same to a capable subject, the effect is true and infallible Faith, but it is not the effect of the Church, or instrument (or mean rather) but of the Holy Spirit, of Grace, which taketh occasion from thence to produce Faith, and that infallible. For, Were this Infallibility, we now speak of, the Churches then, when ever the Church should so propound and urge points of Faith, they must needs have an effect in the Soul: For, if they say, The Church teaches in an humane way, they say she teaches in a fallible way: which overthroweth all. And from this is cleared that difficulty, which opposeth a Judge of Scripture and Faith, because none could be found infallible; For not making the Judge the cause of Faith but occasion, he may be necessarily required to Faith: God who is the only principal cause with his holy word, seldom or never concurring without those outward means. And therefore, though I readily enough grant, That the Scriptures are so plainly written, that a single simple person wanting greater helps to attain to the abstruser sense of them, and using his honest and simple endeavour, may easily find so much of the Rule of Faith and holy Life, as to be saved by them; yet I cannot say the same of any men who presuming on Gods power, against his promise, which includeth the use of outward meanes, or mistaking his promise for absolute, when it is conditional, shall look no farther than their own wits shall lead them.

Now, The outward meanes to which God hath annexed his promise of Grace may be these.

First, That which we have here handled, a general and sober submission to the Guides of our youth and our spiritual Fathers and Pastors in Christ; which to forsake, is the part of a wanton and fornicating Soul, according to Solomon. This common Reason and nature it self seem to require of all under Authority, by the disposition of Almighty God; That they in the first place hearken unto the voice and explication of the Church, wherein they are educated, until such time as a greater manifestation of truth shall withdraw them unwillingly from the same. For, so long as Senses are equally probable on both sides, we are obliged by conscience to our proper Fathers in Christ. For, to do otherwise, is to provoke God to deliver such over as light and gadding Husbands, to the impure embraces of any seducer to Schism and Herefie. But, when such a conviction shall be wrought in us, of the errors and unsafety of that communion in which we were educated, That we must either forsake that, or Christ; then must the advice and sentence of our Saviour prevail with us, in St. Luke. *If any man* Luk. 14. 26.

man comes to me, and hate not his Father and Mother and Wife and Children, and Brethren and Sisters, yea and his own Life, also, he cannot be my Disciple. And as we should go against common prudence and humanity it self, out of an opinion, That our Parents natural may err, and set us upon unwarrantable Acts, to turn them off, and deny all obedience unto them, least they should lead us into errors; so should we do very unchristianly, and against apparent precepts of Scripture, contemptuously and proudly to deny submission both of Judgement and practise unto our spiritual Parents, because, forsooth, they are men, and may err, the Spirit of disobedience tacitly insinuating unto us a much more pestilent opinion, That while we do as best liketh our selves, we shall be much more safe, if not infallible, as if we might not err. But of this, as we have already spoken in part, so may there offer it self a more proper place, more fully to speak afterward.

1 Cor. 2. 11.

A second general means to attain the true sense of Scripture is indeed the Spirits assistance, by which it was at first composed: There is certainly none like to that. For, (as St. Paul hath it.) *What man knoweth the things of a man save the Spirit of a man, which is in him? Even so the things of God knoweth no man, but the Spirit of God.*

The only hazard we here run is, (and that no small one) That we presume not lightly upon such a peculiar guidance of the Spirit, which we have not.

Mat. 21. 22.

Luk. 11. 13.

The general remedie therefore of this evil, is that prescribed by our Lord Christ, *viz.* Prayer. For, Thus he speaketh by St. Mathew. *All things whatsoever ye ask in prayer, believing, ye shall receive.* And more particularly by St. Luke. *If ye then being evil know how to give good gifts unto your children: how much more shall your heavenly Father give the holy Spirit to them that ask them.*

Augustin. de  
Doct. christ.  
Lib. 3. cap. 2.

And a Third means is when, being soundly and well instructed in the general drift and design of Faith, or Gods holy word, we by the Analogy which one part of Faith must bear with another, do judge of the truth, or error of any thing contained in Scripture.

Id. 16. cap. 3.

And, To this belongs a Fourth, as it is commonly reckoned, *viz.* due and prudent comparing of several places of Scripture; knowing that no sense can be admitted of Scripture, which disagreeeth with any part of Scripture.

Skill or knowledg of the original tongues in which they were wrot, may be accounted a Fifth meanes, and herein a special observation of the several Idioms of both Old and New Testament.

Lastly, Consideration of the Histories of Countries, Persons, and Customs, to which Holy writ do relate. To these, several others of inferior Order might be named, but I here pass them, to come to a more exact and seasonable treatise of Tradition, so much conducing to the above said ends.

## CHAP. XII.

*Of Tradition as a Means of Understanding the Scriptures. Of the Certainty of unwritten Traditions; that it is inferior to Scripture, or Written Tradition. No Tradition equal to Sense or Scripture in Evidence. Of the proper use of Tradition.*

**T**O this place is due the Treating of Tradition, as well for the better compleating of what may yet seem wanting in directions for the attaining the proper sense of the Rule of Faith, the Scripture, as because of the pretensions, in its behalf, made by some to an equal share in the Rule it self; by laying down this fundamental Division of the Word of God, into *Written*; commonly called *Scripture*: and *Unwritten*; called *Tradition*.

And, That the Word of God may be left unwritten, as well as written, is undeniable; nay, That actually it was delivered by word of mouth, before it was committed to writing, is evident from the infinite Sermons of the Apostles, Evangelists, and Evangelical Preachers, who declared the same. For, To them who were contemporary to the immediate Disciples of Christ, the word of God was delivered by speech, to the end it might be written, so far as it seemed expedient to Divine Providence, for the perpetual benefit of succeeding generations: but to us, The word of God is preached vocally, or orally, because it is written. And so we read our Saviour himself used it against the Devil and incredulous Jews: not quoting the uncertain and unnecessary Traditions remaining with the Jews, but the written Word, saying by St. *Mathew*; \* *It is written, man shall not live by bread alone.* And verse the seventh, *It is written again.* And the third time, *It is written, thou shalt worship the Lord thy God*, &c. And so by St. *John*, and innumerable other places, *It is written in your Law.* Christ in all his disputes against his Jewish adversaries, seldome or never arguing from their Traditions, which were many, but from the written word of God only.

And notwithstanding, speaking Philosophically, it is not repugnant to reason, That things delivered from Father to Son, through many ages, should persevere in their pristine integrity, and be preserved incorrupt in the main; yet is it inconsistent with the Fallibility of humane nature, to secure them in all Points from violation, either without writing, or with. All the world concurring in this: That the Invention of Letters was a special gift of God towards Mankind, for the more safe and profitable continuance of things passed to following times. Such an intollerable Paradox is that which modern Wits (their scarce tollerable Tenets urging them thereunto) have of late vented, and to their best defended; That Tradition, taken in contradistinction to Writing, is more safe than writing;

*Moreman said, the Church was before the Scriptures—*

*Philpot shewed that his argument was fallacious. For he took the Scriptures only to be that which is written by men in letters, whereas in very deed all Prophecy uttered by the Spirit of God was counted to be Scripture. Fox*

*Martyr. Vol. 3.*

*page 29.*

*\*Mat. 4.V.4.*

*7.*

*10. Joh. 8.17.*

*Cresies Exomologesis.*



as if writing had not all the privileges belonging to oral Tradition, with great advantage: or because written monuments may suffer by tract of time, and passing so many hands, unwritten traditions might pass so many ages and mouths inviolate: When, while we see too great variety in the reading, or letter of books, we could be so blind as not to behold infinite more of the same nature in Traditions: It is as seldome found, That a tale should be reported in the very same phrase or words it was at first told, as it is that things transcribed with any common honesty, or diligence, should fail considerably, so much as in the Letter. And if they say, in Tradition, forms of words are not so much to be stood upon, doth it not altogether hold as good when this Tradition is written? How then do not men blush to argue so boldly, and at the same time so weakly?

There is therefore a twofold Infallibility to be distinguished, as well in Relation to unwritten Doctrines, as written; the one consisting in the Matter delivered; the other in the manner so delivering: And truly, as to this later, it cannot be said, without some strong Presumption to the contrary, the written Traditions which are the Scriptures, have been so precisely and absolutely defended from either the common injuries of time, or special miscarriages incident to humane frailty, or perhaps, as some conjecture, the studious mischiefs of sacrilegious hands laid on them, as not one title, one word, one period should not have been damnified thereby. The Providence of God (granting some such minuter defections from the Original Copies) hath been singular in preserving them in that degree of perfection and entireness, we now enjoy them: So that infinite is the disparity in this case between them and unwritten Traditions, which none have been so audacious positively to affirm (though indeed their large and loose reasons seem to tend that way) that any one unwritten doctrine hath been conserved unto us in the same form of words it was at first delivered to the Church.

And the like, though not so great advantage is to be acknowledged on the Scriptures part, compared with the pretended unwritten word of God, in reference to the matter: and that in these three respects. 1. The Evidence. 2. The Importance; and 3. The Influence that the doctrine of the Scriptures have, and ought to have over all Traditions.

And for the first; It is impossible (taking traditions as they are distinguished from Scripture) that the like grounds of Faith should be offered to us, as we have above shown are to be found, proving the Scriptures to be the word of God. For are all, or some only Gods word? All cannot be, because Traditions in several Places of the world have been diverse, and even contrary. Because some are acknowledged to have been the Constitutions of Men; or the Church, since the Apostolical Age. Because many are acknowledged to have been quite lost. Because many have been confessed to be changed, of them which remain. Now if the Church hath failed in the due Custodie of such treasures committed to her, How can any man be assured sufficiently of the integrity of the remainder? How can the Church be esteemed an Infallible Witness of traditions? And who can but admire the Confidence of such Patrons of the Churches fidelity, or rather felicity (for I would not, nor need I call in question its good will and Honesty) in her Office of Preserving the Monuments of our Religion untouched by errors, who by reasons would demonstrate that that cannot be, which we see done before our eyes? For at other times the same Party, if not the same persons, stick not to profess, that divers Antienter Traditions are perished, and more modern have succeeded them. They say, that some Traditions are as crum-

ble as sense can make them: The Tradition that there were such famous Cities as Nineve and Babylon, and are such as Constantinople and Rome, requires the same Faith, as the beholding them with our Eyes. But first, It should have been said in the argument, They are as evident as those things we are informed of by our senses: but this is far from truth: All the testimonies of Past and present persons affirming that to be so which I have no sense of immediately, being abundantly sufficient to beget a belief, but not equaling in evidence the testimonie of any mans well-disposed senses. For does not this so general testimonie it self, depend upon a mans senses receiving the same? Or can any man be so well assured, upon the Credit of any persons whatever, that the Apostles delivered such things to be believed and observed by the Church, as if he himself immediately received the same from them?

If it be said, that the case of Ecclesiastical Tradition is far different from humane, in that the Church is divinely assisted to such ends, supposing this at present, still we are no less intregued then before. For, as is said, The *truth* of a thing, and the *Evidence* whereby it appears to be true, are very much different: And here it will be no less difficult to make such a supposed Assistance appear, then the tradition it self, which it commends to the World, upon such pretences. And therefore, they who have sifted this matter more narrowly, and stated it most rationally, have thought it best to forsake such *topicks*, at present, as Extraordinarie Assistances: and tell us plainly, that what the Church doth in this case, she doth it not as divinely directed, but as so many Men delivering their testimonie, which is true, but then, what becomes of Infallibility; all men singly and conjointly, as men, being fallible? Well therefore they proved to tell us, That to a judge of Controversies, Credible Testimonie, or moral infallibilitie may suffice; and to this I agree in the main, though the term *Moral Certainty*, and *Moral Infallibilitie*, seems to me as vain and improper as it is modern: it upon enquirie, amounting to no more then the old Probabilitie well and reasonably grounded

Hen. Holdeni  
Analysis Fid.

The next thing in Holy Writ, is the much greater importance the things therein contained are of, above unwritten doctrines. For who of all the Ancients, but such as are by tradition stigmatized for Heretiques for such their opinions, did constitute any rule of Faith distinct from the Scriptures; or bring any to stand in competition therewith? Some ('tis true) have distinguished between *Dogmas* of Traditions and doctrines of the Scripture, and have affirmed, That as well the one as the other ought to be received by a good Christian. All this we agree to; how, we shall show by and by more fully; and here by comparing this by the words of St. John, saying, *This Commandment have we from him, that he that loveth God, love his brother also*. By which it is not required that any Christian should with the same kind or degree of Love, love his neighbour, with which he loveth God. For we must love God only for his own sake, and our brother for Gods sake. Nay, when God sayes we must love our neighbour as our selves, he does not exclude difference in degrees of love: In like manner, when it is said, That we ought to believe and receive the unwritten as well as written traditions, it was never intended by that excellent Father, that we should admit them in equal veneration. For most things there by him instanced in, are apparently extrinsical to Faith. Therefore the true meaning is, That no good Son of the Catholick Church, can, or ought to refuse the customes, or practices, or forms of words concerning the doctrine of Christ, because

Basil. Ma. de  
spiritu sancto  
Διγμωτη &  
Κηρυγματι.

Joh. 4.21.

cause they are not so express'd or contain'd in Scripture as other matters are.

And if we mark, we shall not find any one thing exacted of Christians in the purest and most flourishing state of the Church, as points of Faith, which only depended upon unwritten Tradition; and were not thought to have the written word of God for their warrant and foundation. And in this one thing (were there no more) doth the prerogative of the Scripture manifest it self sufficiently above Traditions distinct from it: That whatever virtue or credit they have, is first of all owing to the Scriptures. For otherwise, why should not the Traditions of the Jew or Mahometan be as credible to a Christian as they of the Church; but that he suck'd in his principle with his Mothers milk; That the written word of God hath given so fair testimonie of the Church and its traditions? For the testimonie of the Church otherwise, would certainly be no more to be valued than that of any other societie, of like moral honestie. So that the Scriptures must be the very First principle of all Christian belief.

Augustin.

But here steps in the old objection drawn from a most eminent Father of the Church, which Extollers of tradition can as well forget their own names as leave out of their disputations on this subject; though according to their custome they have a very bad memory to bear in mind what hath been sufficiently replied to it. I should not, saith that Father, have believed the Scriptures but for the Church: and yet we have said we should not have believed the Church but for the Scriptures. How can these stand together? Very well, if we please to distinguish the several wayes of information: for in the same there must be granted a repugnancie. And the distinction is much the same with what we have before laid down, viz. Of the Occasion, and the direct Cause of Faith. For though the Churches tradition be an Introduction to the belief of the Scriptures, and such a necessary Cause without which no man ordinarily comes so much as to the knowledge of them: yet it doth not at all follow, that through the influence of that supposed Cause, an effect of Faith is wrought in the Soul concerning them; but from a superiour illumination and interiour power, which has been generally required to such præternatural Acts. As the Woman of *Samarita* brought her fellow Citizens to Christ, but was not the author of that faith which after they had in him as the true Messias; or as the Horse I ride on carrying me from *London* to *York* is not the proper Cause that I see that City, but mine own senses; though I perhaps should never have seen it otherwise.

Joh. 4.

Irenæus.

But another more Ancient and no less venerable Father of the Church is here brought in, demanding, *What if nothing had been written, must we not then have altogether depended on the Traditions?* To such as extend this quærie too far, I move the like question. What if we had no Traditions at all; must not then every man have shifted as well as he could, and traded upon the small stock of natural reason in him? Or was it impossible that man should come to bliss without the superadded light outwardly exhibited? That as the case stands, man ordinarily cannot be saved without such received revelations, as are dealt to us from the Church, I believe: But upon supposal, that no such means were extant, that there should be no other Ordinary way of Gods revealing himself to man in order to his salvation, believe it who will, for me. I answer therefore directly, No question but tradition would have sufficed, if nothing had been committed to writing. For either God would have remitted of that rigour (as no man can doubt but he might have made the terms of the Covenant fewer, and lighter) with which we now stand obliged to him according to that most equal Law of the Gospel, as well as Reason,



Reason, *Unto whom much is given, of him shall be much required: and to whom men have committed much, of him they will ask the more.* Neither is it probable, against the intent of Christs most excellent Parable, in St. *Mathew*: that of that Person, or that People to whom he hath delivered but two, or five Talents, he should extort the Effect of ten. Well therefore doth that Father argue against such as should dare to confine God only to Scripture, and so superciliously or contemptuously look on the Traditions of their Christian Fathers, as not worth the stooping to take up; yea, as necessarily warring against the Word written: Whenas it is certain, a thing is written because it is first declared; and is the Word of him that speaketh, no less before, than after it is written; and not so, because it is written. St. *Paul* therefore joyns them both together, in his Epistle to the *Theſſalonians*, saying: *Therefore brethren stand stedfast and hold the Traditions, which ye have been taught, whether by word or our Epistle.* Here are plainly both *written* Traditions, and *unwritten*; and *written* Word of God, and *unwritten*: and they differ only in the several ways of promulgation, and not in the Law of God. And it is more then probable, That those first principles of Christian Faith were not received of St. *Paul* in writing; of which he speaks in his first Epistle to the *Corinthians*, concerning the Incarnation, Passion and Resurrection of our Saviour, nor delivered in writing at his first publication; yet were no less the word of God then, than afterward.

Luk. 12. 48.

Mat. 25.

2 Theſſ. 2. 15.

1 Cor. 15. 1, 2,  
3, 4.

Yet, as this sufficiently allayes the heat of hostility indiscreetly conceived against all Traditions, even for the very names sake, which is become odious to us; so doth it not so much favour the contrary party, as hath been phantasi'd. For 'tis observable, That there is a very great difference between the Tradition now touched, and that so commonly and passionately disputed of in the Church. That was, and may be called a Tradition, as every thing expressed by Word or Writing, whereby one man delivers his mind (for so the *English* Phrase hath it, not amiss) to another transiently: But the Tradition now under debate may be described, *A constant continuation of what is once delivered, from Generation to Generation.* For, No man can with any propriety of speech, term what is not a year or two in standing Tradition. Tradition is a long custom of believing. The things which are so called in the Scriptures, are not such; and therefore can be no president for those of these dayes. There being not the like reason, that we should give the same respect, or esteem so Apostolical, that which now is so reputed, and that which any mans memory might assure him was so in very deed the Apostles Doctrine.

This controversie then seems to come to this issue. First, in Reason, Whether Oral and Memorial Tradition can be so secure, as Scriptural? The resolution of which doubt almost every man may make sufficiently, of himself, and hath been competently treated of above.

The other Question is about matter of Fact, Whether the Church of God did ever so unanimously agree in the necessity, validity or Sacredness of any Traditions not contained in the written Word of God, as to equal them with this? This we absolutely deny: And upon the account of Tradition it self: There being no such Tradition to be found in all the Records of the Church; that Tradition is so highly to be valued. Again, there appearing consent sufficient in the Church for many ages, That as to the Material parts of Christian doctrine the Scriptures do sufficiently instruct us, as a Rule, and Law of believing. For, If the Law of *Moses*, as a Law,

was

was sufficient before the Prophets added to it, for the People of God under that Dispensation. And the Law and the Prophets were still sufficient till *John* and *Christ*, is it to be believed, That the Law of Christians delivered by Christs appointment should fall short of the same ends now? It is truly affirmed, That what *St. Paul* writeth in commendation of Scripture, was intended chiefly, if not only of the books of the Old Testament, *viz. That they were able to make a man wise unto Salvation through Faith that is in Christ Jesus*: and, *All Scripture is given by Inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for correction, for instruction in Righteousness: That the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works.* Now, if the Scriptures of the Old Testament were sufficient to bring a man to the Faith of Christ, and to instruct him to Salvation, can any man reasonably doubt, Whether the much clearer, and fuller manifestation of the Doctrine of Christ, and Salvation, by the books of the New Testament, are sufficient to the same end, joyned to the obscurer of the Old? I know there are that say expressly, No: and endeavour to make it good by several instances very material to Faith; and yet not expressed in Scripture; and yet again, of force to be believed by all that would be good Christians: As the Articles of the Trinity, and of Christs Person consisting of humane and divine nature: Of his being born of the blessed Virgin. Some other are added hereunto, but they are either such as are neither favoured by Scripture, nor good Tradition; as Invocation of Saints, Purgatory, &c. or have only a general warrant from Scripture and Tradition; and such are they which are of a mutable nature, Rites and Ceremonies of the Church: which ought not, when confirmed by long consent and use in the Church, lightly to be refused and cast off; so when any Church, having power over its own body, shall think fit to alter, is that Church to be refused as a true Church, by others. But to the first of these, we stick not openly to profess, That it suffices to believe so much only as is really contained in, and soberly deducible from the Scriptures; taking these articles of Faith separately from certain accessory obligations of all good Christians, For instance. It is not required to believe the doctrine now established in the Catholick Church concerning the Trinity, in the forms at present received from the nature of the Articles themselves, which may with safety sufficient be assented to, as they are simply found in Scripture: yet considering, That Hereticks have stirred up most dangerous and sacrilegious doubts, to the obviating them, and securing the main stake which would be endangered if farther explications were not found out and imposed, it is needful to receive them also, or at least not to oppose and declare against them. For 'tis very well known, there passed some ages before the Articles of the Trinity of Persons were so much stood on, or so well settled as now they are, and that Tradition was as much to seek as the written Word of God, to bring things to that pass they now are in.

And for Christ's manner of birth, I know no such Tradition either written or unwritten which required antiently any more than to believe barely, That the eternal Son of God became man, and was incarnate, and born of a woman, who was a pure Virgin; but probable circumstances and reverence to the high Mystery of Christs Person obliged to the honorary part of that Article. And the like answer may be made to another instance about Pædobaptism, which some, as occasion offers, will say is required in Scripture; and again, it serving at other times their turn better to deny it,

it, will hold the contrary. For Baptism of Infants, as Infants, is not indeed required by Scripture; but as persons saveable, it is: the rule general in Scripture running thus, *Except a man be born of water and the Holy Ghost he cannot be saved.* It is not said, unless a man be born by water, while he is an infant or Child, but absolutely. For had it been so expressed, just doubt might have been made, whether a man baptized at his full age, were effectually baptized? Neither is Baptism appointed signally and precisely for men in years (though none but such at the first preaching of the Gospel who could profess their Faith could be capable of it) but indefinitely it is spoken without any limitation; and therefore sufficiently implied. Other instances against the plenitude of Scripture as a Rule of Faith have either already been touched (as that which tells us, It is nowhere contained in Scripture that the Scriptures are the word of God, neither can it be proved by it: for no more can it be demonstrated by Tradition) or may be easily brought to the same end.

To conclude this point, having shewed what we mean by Tradition, and what it serveth not to, it were unreasonable to leave it slurr'd so, and not to give it its due in shewing the great use thereof in the Church of Christ. For however we make it not supream, nor coequal with the written word of God, it may without any offence or invasion of Divine Right or Autoritie claim the next place to it; and as *Joseph to Pharaoh* be greater then all the the people besides, but inferiour to *Pharaoh* in the Throne. Of God it is said, *Thou satest in the Throne judging right.* God now judges by his Word *Psal. 94.* writtē, as by a Law and Rule of faith, as is shewed. Yet, I see no reason for the injudicious zeal and reverence of such who think they cannot give enough unto the Scriptures, unless in word and pretence (for tis no more, themselves constantly acting contrarie to their profession) they ascribe all the Form of Judging unto the Scriptures, and all things determinable to their decision. I wish with all my heart (so far am I from an evil eye or niggardly affection towards Scripture) they could make their words good, when they tell us all things are contained in Scripture, It is a perfect Rule of all emergent doubts and acts in the Church, It is Judge and Law both of Controversies; but alas, they cannot: For they take away from it more then by this rank kindness they give to it. Gods word is Perfect as a Law, and so far as he intended it: but it must cease to be a Law and take another nature upon it, if it were a Judge too in any proper sense: And the Canon of Scripture must be it self variable and mutable, if it could particularly accommodate it self to all occasions and exigencies of Christians. But this is not only absurd, but needles. For God, when he made men Christians, did not take away from them what they before had as Men, but required and ordained that humane judgement and reason should be occupied and sanctified by his divine Revelations. He in brief gave them another, and far better Method, Aid, and Rule to judge by; and did not destroy, or render altogether useles their Judgement even in matters sacred. *To the Law and to the Testimonie* (saies the holy Prophet) *if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them.* This indeed plainly declares the Rule by which we are to walk, and Judge: but it doth not tell us that the Law it self doth speak; but men according to it: And this is to Judge. Now, because no one man, no one age, no one Church should judge for all, no nor for it self, contrary to all, doth the necessity and expedience of Tradition, not to affront or violate, but secure the written word of God; and that in two special respects, appear.



*Consuetudo etiam in Civilibus rebus pro Lege suscipitur, cum deficit Lex; nec differt Scripturâ, an ratione consistat, quando & Legem ratio commendat.*  
Tertul. de coron. mil. cap. 4.

First, as giving great light and directions unto the Rulers of the Church, and limiting the uncertain and loose wit of man, which probably would otherwise (according to its natural pronitie) flie out into new and strange senses dayly, of holy Scripture. The Records of the Church, like so many Prefidents, and Reports in our Common Law, giving us to understand how such places of Scripture were formerly understood, and on which side the case controverted passed. And why this course in divine matters should not be approved, I see not, unless unquiet and guilty persons shall seek, under colour of a more absolute appeal to Scripture (which is here supposed to be sincerely appealed unto before) to wind themselves into the seat of Judicature, and at length, not only as fallibly, but also usurpingly, decree for themselves and others too. This event hath so manifestly appeared, that there is no denying of it, or defending it. They therefore who professedly introduce Tradition, to the defeating and nulling of Scripture, deal indeed more broadly, and in some sense more honestly, (as being what they seem) than they, who give all, and more then all due to it in language, but in practise overthrow it. But we making Tradition absolutely subordinate and subservient to Scripture, and in a word, of the nature of a Comment and not of the Text it self, we are yet to seek not what deceitfully and passionately (for we know enough of that already) but soberly can be objected against it. For if it be said, Tradition is it self uncertain, it is obscure, it is perished, it contradicts it self, and so can be of little use: we readily joyn with them so far, as to acknowledge that such traditions, and to them to whom they so appear can with no good reason be appealed to: But we deny that there are none but such; and that such as prove themselves to be true and honest men upon due trial and examination, ought to be hang'd out of the way, because they were found in company with thieves and Cheats.

Supposing then, That such honest Traditions are to be found in the Church; another great benefit redoundeth to the Church from thence, in that it doth, in some cases, supply the defects of the Law it self, the Scripture. But here, I must first get clear of this reputed Scandal given, in that I suppose the Scriptures defective, or imperfect: I have already, and do again profess its plenitude and sufficiency, as far as a Rule or Law is well capable of. Now, what God by his infinite wisdom and power might have done, I cannot question, in contriving such an ample Law as should comprehend all future and possible contingencies in humane affairs; but this I say, That he disposing things by another Rule, *viz.* to act according to humane capacity and condition, never did, or so much as intended to deliver such an infinite Law. Is not *Moses*, and Gods dealing to him, and his ministry to God, and the people, frequently alledged as a notable argument to convince us of the amplitude of the New Testament? *Moses* (say they) *was faithful in all his house*: And therefore much more was Christ. Very good: and what of all this? As much as comes to nothing. For wherein did the faithfulness of *Moses* consist? In powering out unmeasurably all that might be said touching divine matters: Or rather in delivering faithfully and exactly all that God commanded him? This truly did *Moses*; and therefore was very true and faithful to him that sent him, and gave him his charge. This did Christ, and this did the Apostles of Christ, and his inspired servants; and therefore were all no less faithful to God than *Moses*. But did not *Moses* leave more cases untouched in the Administration of the Jewish Policie, then were literally expressed

Heb. 3. 2.

pressed? Yes surely; judging it sufficient, that he had laid down general Rules and Precepts, according to which, Emergencies (which might be infinite) should, by humane prudence, be reduced, and accordingly determined. And so (choose they or refuse they) must they grant did Christ, and his Instruments, leave the Law of the Gospel; which yet not wanting all that can be expected from a Law, cannot modestly be pronounced imperfect, notwithstanding (as is said) manifold particulars are not there treated of. Now those are they we say, Tradition doth in some measure supply unto us; and the defect of Tradition it self (which hath not considered all things) is made good by the constant power of the Church, given by the Scriptures themselves, in such cases: which require determination of circumstances of time, place, order, and manner of Gods service, according to the Edification of the Church of Christ.

### CHAP. XIII.

*Of the nature of Faith. What is Faith. Of the two general grounds of Faith. Faith divine in a twofold sense. Revelation the Formal reason of Faith Divine. Of the several senses and acceptations of Faith. That Historical Temperance, and Miraculous Faith are not in nature distinct from Divine and Justifying Faith. Of Faith Explicit and Implicit.*

**H**AVING thus spoken of the Rule of Christian Faith, and its Auxiliary, Tradition; we are now to proceed to the Nature and Acts, the Effects, Subject, and Object of it. For as all Christian Religion is summed up in one Notion of Christian Faith, so all Faith may be reduced unto the foresaid Heads. Faith taken in its greatest extent, containeth as well Humane as Divine: And may be defined, *A firm assent of the mind to a thing reported.* And there are two things which principally incline the mind to believe. The Evidence of the thing offered to the understanding, or the Fidelity and Veracity of him that so delivers any thing unto us. For if the thing be apparent in it self, to our reasons or senses, we presently believe it: And if the thing be obscure and difficult to be discerned by us, yet if we stand assured of the faithfulness of him that so reports it to us, and his wisdom, we yield assent thereunto.

But Faith properly Divine hath a twofold fountain so constituting and denominating it, The Matter believed, which is not common nor natural, but spiritual and heavenly. But more especially that Faith is Divine, which is not produced in the soul of Man upon any natural reasons necessarily inferring the same, but upon a superior motive inducing unto it, that is,

*Fides, est domini divinitus infusum menti hominis, quæ citra ullam hesitantiam credit esse verissimam, quæcumque nobis Deus per utrumque Test. tradidit ac promissit. Erasmi. in Symbolum.*

Mat. 16. 17.

Autoritie divine; and because it hath declared and revealed so much unto us, as St. Peter believing Christ to be the Son of God, it is said, *Flesh and Blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father which is in heaven.* This was a divine Faith upon a double respect. 1. by reason of the object, Christ, a divine person. 2. by reason of the Cause, God, by whose power he believed the same, it not being in the power of flesh and blood, any natural reason, to convince the judgement so far as absolutely to believe, That Christ was so the Son of God, so that to be revealed is that which makes the Faith properly divine, and not the divine object or thing believed. For as it hath been observed by others, any thing natural, and which by natural reason may be demonstrated and so must be believed by a natural Faith, being also commended unto us upon divine authority or revelation may be also believed by a divine Faith. That there is an invisible Deity is clearly demonstrable from the visible things of this World, and accordingly may and ought to be believed, upon the warrant of natural reason it self, as St. Paul teacheth us saying, *The Invisible things of him from the Creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even his eternal power and Godhead: so that they are without excuse.* That is, If God had not revealed all this, yet men ought to believe this, out of sense and reason: but this hinders not, but this very thing should become an article of our Creed also, and so, because it is revealed, Form in us a divine Faith.

Rom. 1. 20.

But we must be aware of an ambiguity in Revelation, which may mislead us. For sometimes Revelation is used for the thing revealed: And sometimes for the Act Revealing: that which we call now, *The Revelation of St John*, and in truth all Scriptures as we have them now, are the things God did reveal unto his servants, but the Act whereby they were revealed or the Act revealing this to them, ended with the persons receiving them.

And this is no superfluous or curious observation, because of a received maxim in the Schools, *That without a supernatural act we cannot give due assent unto a supernatural object, nor believe truths revealed by God without a superadded aid of Grace illuminating and inclining the mind to assent thereto.* From whence doth follow, That, of all divine Faith is most properly, if not only divine, which doth believe that such things are Revealed of God, and not, That, which supposes them to have been revealed by God, and that he said so as is expressed unto us doth believe. For this latter, even any natural man and greatest infidel in the world would believe, who believes there is a God: it being included and implied in the very notion of a Deity, that God cannot lie or deceive, or affirm a thing to be, which is not. But the Christian Faith mounts much higher then Heathens, and by the Grace of God believes that God hath *Revealed* such things, wherein consists his Christian Faith.

The first thing then a true believer indeed must believe, is, That the Scriptures are the word of God; and this as it is the most fundamental, so is it most difficult of all to one not educated in the Faith of Christians; because it neither can be proved by Scripture, nor whatever men, who promise nothing less in their presumptuous methods then clear demonstrations, may say, and argue by Tradition: The Scriptures, (though not testimony of it self, yet) matter and manner may induce, and Tradition fortifie that; but the Crown of all true Christian Faith must be set on by Gods Grace.



A Second thing in order, is, when we believe that God hath spoken such things, that we believe the things themselves so delivered to us of God. For though as is said, any rational heathen may well do this, yet many a Christian doth it not. For, *The fool not in knowledge so much as practise, hath said in his heart, there is no God*: faith the Psalmist, and St. Paul, that many out of an evil conscience have made Shipwreck of their Faith, which really once they had.

Psalm. 14. 1.  
1 Tim. 1. 9.

A third degree of Christian Faith, is, When not onely we believe that God hath revealed his Law unto us, and what he hath so revealed to be most faithful, true, and holy; but obey the same. For in Scripture Faith is taken for Obedience, and Obedience for Faith; as in the famous instance of *Abraham*, who is said to believe God; and that his Faith was counted for Righteousness. And why is *Abraham* said to believe God so signally? Because he was perswaded that God bade him offer up his Son unto him? No, but because he did it by Faith, as is witnessed in the Epistle to the Hebrews. And this acception of Faith is much confirmed by the contrary speech of Scripture, in whose sense, they who obey not God, are commonly said not to believe him: as in the Book of Deuteronomie, *Likewise when the Lord sent unto you from Kadesh-Barnea, saying, Go up and possess the Land which I have given you, then ye rebelled against the Commandement of the Lord your God, and believed him not, nor hearkened unto his voice.* And therefore in the Acts of the Apostles it is said, *A great company of the Priests were obedient unto the Faith.* That is, believed what was Preached by the Apostles. And yet more expressly St. Pauls phrase to the Romans declares this, where he saith, *But unto them that are contentions and do not obey the truth, but obey unrighteousness, indignation and wrath.* For no man can so properly be said to Obey, as to Believe a truth.

Heb. 11. 17.

Deut. 9. 23.

Acts. 6. 8.

Rom. 2. 8.

But that distinction of greatest moment to the illustrating of many obscurities, and solving many doubts arising to Christian Readers out of the Scripture, and especially St. Pauls Epistles, is that of Faith, into the Doctrine of Faith or Object, and in sum, the whole New Covenant as manifested in the New Testament: And the Act and Grace of Faith in a true Believer. The former is that which we are required to believe: The latter signifies the inward propension to the receiving the things so manifested in the Gospel: And is again subdivided into Faith complexly, or generally taken, and specially: that, as comprehending the whole duty of a true Believer, and all Christian Graces flowing from that Fountain, and built upon that Foundation: This, as distinct from the two other Theological Graces, Hope and Charity; of all which St. Paul treateth distinctly, in his first Epistle to the Corinthians, concluding his thirteenth Chapter thus, *And now abideth Faith, Hope, and Charity.* And that Faith is taken for the Doctrine of Faith, or of Christ revealed in the Gospel, is very plain and very necessary to be noted; as in the place to the Romans even now touched: where, as Obedience is taken for the act of believing; Faith is taken for the Gospel it self: And in the same Book it is written that *Felix sent for Paul and heard him concerning the Faith in Christ*: that surely was the Gospel or Doctrine of Christ, or through Christ. And St. Paul to Timothy, *Now the Spirit speaketh expressly, that in the latter times, some shall depart from the Faith, giving heed to seducing spirits and doctrines of Devils*: Where Doctrines of Devils is opposed to Faith, the Doctrine of Christ. And in the Acts, *Elimas is said to seek to turn away the Go-*

1 Cor. 13. 13.

Acts. 6. 7.

Acts. 24. 24.

1 Tim. 4. 1.

Acts. 13. 8.

vernour

vernour from the Faith. And so Act. 14. 22. And Faith is not only so taken for the Gospel as opposed to Gentile, but Jewish works and worship, or the Law of *Moses*; and that most frequently in *St. Pauls* Epistles, as shall appear more plainly by and by.

In the mean time, here preparing grounds for a more important disquisition, it will not be amiss to note other supposed kinds of Faith: of which four are vulgarly by modern Divines pitch't upon, as of a quite different nature and form. They are *Historical Faith*, *Temporarie Faith*, which last but for a season, *Miraculous Faith*, seen in working of miracles. All which terms of Faith I without any more ado, grant to have ground in Scripture as so many distinct Acts, but not kinds of Faith. They are very unadvisedly distinguished as several *Species* because several events or effects: they may be all brought under that of Justifying Faith, not as *Species* under their *Genus*, but as parts are reduced to the whole, or degrees inferiour, to the highest. For undoubtedly *Historical Faith*, as they call it, whereby a man gives a general Credence or assent to what is delivered in Scripture, is a degree and good step to that called Justifying Faith, and there is no Justifying Faith without it: And so are the Acts of a Temporary Faith, and Miraculous Faith, acts of a Justifying Faith. For, as for the *temporarieness*, or failing, it distinguishes Christian Faith neither from Gentile, nor Jewish belief; nor true from false, but only as to the Event, that the one continues and comes to perfection, and the other comes to untimely end. Which puts no more difference between the Justifying and not Justifying Faith: then the untimely death of a child does distinguish him from a man: which is in growth, not in nature; according to which all good distinctions ought to be made. For, if nothing be wanting to the denominating this failing Faith, a Justifying and saving Faith, but duration, how can they be thus reasonably distinguished? And as to the Faith producing miracles, it is the very same in nature with that which was required by our Saviour Christ, to have miracles wrought upon them that were by him miraculously cured, than which nothing occurs more frequently in the Gospels: and is an act of Justifying Faith; as supposing the belief of Christ, according as the Gospel describes him, which as it shall be shewed presantly, is the true Justifying Faith. For as Christ himselfe saith in *St. Mark*, *No man shall do a Miracle in my name that can lightly speak evil of me*; So that by Faith in Christ such miracles being wrought, who can denie it to be the effect of a Justifying Faith? But that which may have deceived men, is an opinion, That what ever proceeds from a Justifying Faith, must needs proceed from it, as it justifies. For in truth, Miracles, or the gift of the working them, is not that which commends us to God, to our justification; but to men: and Graces rather than Gifts, both Sanctify and justify. Yet this hinders not, but Justifying Faith may be the spring from whence that Gift proceeds, and so not opposite to it. But it is here commonly said, That Heathens and Reprobates may have the three sorts of Faith, here opposed to Justifying Faith. But I must crave leave to denie, and declare their error herein. For, It is a contradiction to say, A man can so much as Historically believe all the Gospel, and yet continue an Infidel. The Devil therefore believing, as *St. James* tells us, (for his words are much stood upon in this Case) is no Infidel. And yet he, nor prophane Believers and reprobates are not true Christians; not because they have nothing faithful in them, but because this good ground and Justifying Faith Inchoate, being, as the Schools speak, unformed, and destitute of a proportion of Charity and obedience

Mark. 9. 39.

Once, never increases to act, or reap fruits of Righteousness, which is to be Justified. And Reprobates Faith may be true Faith, so much as they have of it, and so long as they hold it: For God forbid that their Faith should make them Reprobates: It is their want of Faith in perfection, and perseverance that so distinguishes them. For were not that Faith true, real, and saving which they have, or had; they might be damned for having no Faith at all, but they cannot be damned for not continuing and growing in that Faith, as the Scriptures assure us some shall. And no more at present needs here be alledged than what St. Peter at large delivereth, *1 Epistle. C. 2. V. 13, 14. 15. 20, &c.*

Some add hereunto an Hypocritical Faith: which indeed must needs be quite of another kind, but what it is no man can tell further than from the negative notion, *viz.* That it is not true Faith; and so no Justifying Faith, but a shadow of it, not the thing: but the foremention'd Faiths are, or may be, real and Good: but Hypocritical can never be so as *Hypocritical*. But we shall conclude this Chapter with an other observation, we conceive, has occasion'd misbelief concerning Justifying Faith. For it is too commonly believed, That a'l Justifying Faith must and doth necessarily and actually Justify all in whom it is: But that is not so, but that is truly Justifying Faith which in its own nature tendeth thereunto, though peradventure defeated of its effect. For, if natural causes have not alwayes their proper effects through outward impediments, may it not be much rather the case of spiritual things which work not naturally, but freely?

To the former distinctions of Faith may be well added another; and that of Faith Explicite and Implicite, much insisted on, and therefore here to be considered. And it cannot be, neither is it denied, but really such cases there are in which good Christians have not that plenitude of Faith desirable, and in some cases, necessarie. For otherwise, we must condemn the Faith of St. Peter himself, so much commended by Christ himself; when he openly professed the Deitie of our Saviour Christ. For not long after Christ sharply rebuked him for his ignorance of this Passion of him; saying, *Get thee behind me Satan, thou art an offence unto me.* And, so were the Disciples ignorant of the Resurrection of Christ, and of the Ascension of Christ, supposing his Kingdom should be rather a Temporal than Spiritual and eternal; as appeareth by their Question, *Wilt thou at this time restore again the Kingdom unto Israel?* And I make no doubt, after so much evidence from the Histories of the Primitive times, that many Eminently holy persons suffering martyrdom for Christ, were very meanly seen, and settled in divers of those Articles of Faith, which have been since imposed as necessarie on the Church, and indeed ought to be. How this can be allowed is therefore to be inquired into. And to this end; First, it must be determin'd, what may be meant by *Implicit*, and *Explicit* Faith. That we call Explicit Faith, which clearly, distinctly, and expressly believes an article of Faith, or any divine truth revealed. Implicit then, must be such a Faith that believes obscurely and confusedly only. Secondly, it is necessarie to distinguish this distinction it self. For, Faith may be said to be Implicit, either in respect of its object: or of its Act. The First Implicitness consisteth in this, That a Christian believing some one material article of Faith clearly and expressly, may be said to believe that which is included in that, and necessarily follows from it. As he that shall believe that Christ consisteth of a divine and humane nature, may be said to believe that article contained, as it were, under it, *viz.* That Christ had

Mat. 16. 16, 17, 18.

Mat. 16. 23.

Act. 1. 6.



had a humane will, as well as divine; though his ignorance be such as never to have particularly considered the same. But the Act of Faith I call implicate, is when a man being, (as they say) a Christian or Believer at large, and liking that Religion very well, shall without search, without knowledge of the principal points of Faith, shuffle all together, and conclude all (as he thinks) sufficiently in this, That he believes as a good Christian or Catholick believes; as the Church believes.

1 Cor. 3. 2.  
1 Cor. 2. 6.

The First of these kinds of Faith must necessarily be allowed as good and laudable, provided it be not accompanied with an affected ignorance or sloth, hindering a mans proficiencie in the Extent and Intention, or degrees of it. For surely this means the Holy Scripture, when it saith, *I have fed you with Milk; and not with meat: for hitherto, ye were not able to bear it, neither yet now are ye able.* And again, *Howbeit we speak wisdom among them that are perfect: yet not the wisdom of this world, &c.* Which intimate unto us, That the servants of Christ imitating their Master herein, did not presently pour forth all the several Mysteries of the Kingdom of God, and of Faith, but proceeding gradually laid first the foundation, Christ Jesus, and according to the capacitie of their Converts, opened the rest more Explicitly afterward. And I make no doubt but the obscure and narrow Faith of the unlearned, being generally more sincere and firm than that of the knowing and inquisitive, shall lead them to Heaven, no less than that more ample: Christs equal proceedings being such, as not to require the same of all, in quantitie of *measure* but of *proportion* to their state, and his Gifts and Graces conferred on men.

Col. 3. 16.  
*Ignæ res fies est, ubicunque ociosa est, non est. Sed quemadmodum in lucerna oleum alit flammam ne extinguatur, ita Charitatis opera fidem alunt ne deficiant. Fides gignit bona opera: Sed illa vicissim nutriunt parentem. Erasmus in Symbolum.*

But that other sort of Faith which satisfies it self with the sincerity and Catholickness of it, and that it is of such a sort, not attending to or endeavouring after any further illumination, or information in the branches arising from that root, we cannot see how men can speak reasonably, or conscionably in the commendation of it, or such who are owners of it, can hope to receive any greater benefit, than to be numbred amongst true Believers without the reward. For, it is expressly against Gods word, which requireth that the *Word of God should dwell in you richly in all wisdom, &c.* And the reason hereof is, because the obedience of Faith (of which before) is generally proportionable to the Faith it self from whence it springs. How then can any man act (as all men are tied) with an universal obedience, who know not nor believe what they are obliged to do, but by that Faith which is wanting in them? And rudely and effectedly to rest quietly under the imaginarie protection of believing as the Church believes, may indeed keep men (which is all commonly lookt after, here) from being Hereticks, but it doth not secure them from being Heathens. For, what ever is said and pretended, such ignorant persons do not believe as the Church believes. For when the Church believes Expressly, and they believe confusedly, do they believe as the Church believes? When the Church believes she knows what, and they believe they know not what, do they believe as the Church believes? Lastly, when the Church believes directly and positively things as they are propounded, and these believe negatively, that, is no otherwise then the Church, not oppositely to the sense of it, do they believe as the Church believes? May not a Heathen believe no otherwise then the Church, and yet be an Heathen? Nay, the more naturally stupid and indocil men are, the safer Catholicks they should be, because they do not believe contrary to the Faith of the Church. It may be said that Baptism alone is sufficient to distinguish such implicit believers from Heathens: which I grant, as to the Essence or nature

ture of Christianity, but not to the Life and exercise of a Christian: for that, as St. *Paul* hath by his word and example certified us, is, by *the Faith of the Son of God who loved us and gave himself for us*. Therefore, as I am so charitable to all well-disposed Christians, to be persuaded there is no necessity for all to have either the like measure or manifestation of Faith in any one point of Faith (our Saviour Christ requiring Faith but as a grain of Mustard-seed, sometimes;) so am I to all Churches, as to be persuaded, That they all require, and that in all a some measure of Faith explicite, as necessary to Salvation, and that, besides this, *Believing as the Church believes*. For in truth, this is no point of Faith in the (*Actus Signatus* or) general notion; though to believe the Church Catholick, may be. For who sees not a vast difference, between believing the Church it self, and believing what the Church believes? And that may be compleated in believing the Being, and Extent of it, which is much short of the body of Faith which it receives, and professes.

Col. 2. 20.

Math. 17. 20.

## CHAP. XIV.

*Of the Effects of True Faith in General, Good Works. Good Works to be distinguished from Perfect Works. Actions good four wayes.*

**T**Here is a great difference between Good works, and Perfect works: For the first hath respect unto the thing done; and the other, unto the manner of doing it, agreeable to all due forms and Circumstances. And every work that is good, is not Perfect: though every work that is perfect must of necessity be Good. And to the doing of a Good work, there seems to be no more absolutely required than that a man should act according to well informed and regulated reason, and true affection. So that the works of natural men may be good, though heathens; such as are, Visiting the sick, and relieving the poor, defending the Fatherless and widow oppressed: and especially such outward moral Acts as may be done by natural men tending to their Conversion and Salvation, as willing hearing, and equal judging of the doctrine of Faith, even before actual Faith conceived: for which St. *Paul* esteemed the *Bereans* praise worthy\*. So that they are not absolutely *Splendid Sins*: for were it so, they were by no means to be done, and no man did well, who, before his Conversion, went to hear Christ preach; or gave any attentive ear to what St. *Paul* wrote, or taught, for want of Faith: whereas we are taught by common reason, as well as by St. *Paul*, that Faith it self cometh by hearing of the word of God. For how can any man possibly believe what he never heard of? So then, some duties and Acts are laudable and acceptable to God, without Faith: though not arising to the perfection of Evangelical Goodness, by which a man pleaseth God. and is acceptable unto him even to his Justification and Salvation. There may therefore be distinguished a fourfold goodness in Actions. 1. Natural, when a man acteth agreeable to the perfection of the Rule of natural Beings, as a

A&T. 17. 11.  
Rom. 10. 17.  
Si Fidelis fecerit opus bonum & hinc ei prodest liberans eum a malis: & in illo seculo ad percipiendum regnum celestic, magis autem ibi quam hinc. Si autem Infidelis fecerit bonum opus, hinc ei prodest opus ipsius, & hinc ei reddit Deus pro opere suo. In illo autem seculo nihil ei prodest opus ipsius. Opus imperfectum. In Math. Hom. 26.

Psal. 119. 68.

Verè enim,  
quando decli-  
namus à malo  
et facimus bo-  
num, quantum  
ad comparatio-  
nem ceterorum  
hominum no-  
lentium decli-  
nare à malo et  
facere bonum,  
dicuntur bo-  
naque agimus:  
quantum au-  
tem ad Verita-  
tem, secundum  
quod dicitur  
in hoc loco,  
Quia unus est  
bonus, bonum  
nostrum non est  
bonum. Orig.  
Hom. 8. in  
Matthæum.

\*Hof. 8. 3.  
†1 Tim. 1. 8.

2 Cor. 3. 6.

7.

8.

10.

man acteth agreeable to the perfection of the Rule of natural Beings; as a man is said to walk well, when he goes according to the nature of man, and limps not, nor halts: and to write a good hand, when his letters and words do answer exactly a Perfect Rule or Copie. This, Religion taketh no notice of, at all. 2. A man is said to do a Good Act when it is so morally, and in its kind, as tending to the honour of his Creator, whose Instruments meer Moral men are, in exercising his Paternal providence; and to the benefit of others. For, it being the proper Character of God which is spoken of him by the Psalmist, viz. *Thou art Good and thou doest Good.* They whom God chooseth and stirreth up to minister under him in good and useful things to the Communitie or any particular, do that which is good; however not absolute. 3. There is a Religious or divine goodness in Actions, which are done agreeable to the Revealed Will of God, passing natures sagacitie or search. And this is twofold, Legal and Evangelical, both exceeding the former, but the one exceeded of the other, viz. Legal of Evangelical. For as Natural Acts are good, done according to natures intention and institution, by themselves; but are not good compared with moral duty performed: and moral Acts are Good in themselves, but not so in respect of a Superiour Order and end of working instituted of God in his holy Law; So are Legal Acts wrought according to Gods word given to the Israelites under that dispensation or Covenant as required of God, and serving to those ends God propounded to himself and his people. Wherefore it is that the Children of Israel revolting from God, and forsaking that instituted worship of his Law, are thus censured by the Prophet \**Hosea, Israel hath cast off the thing that is good, the enemy shall pursue him.* And St. Paul, (than whom no divine writer more opposes the Law, occasion being offered, yet) giveth his suffrage †*The Law is good if a man useth it Lawfully.* (And the Gospel it self is not good unless used Lawfully:) Therefore were the works of the Law also, good works, within their bounds; but not so compared with the Perfection of the Gospel; but displeasing to God and pernicious to men, who being delivered in the fulness of time, by the coming of Christ from the Pedagogie and beggerly Elements of the Mosaical Law, should presume to retain that vail which was done away in Christ, and embrace those shadows, the body Christ being present. Hence it is that St. Paul as in many other places, writing to the Corinthians, speaketh thus at large, — *The Letter killeth* (i. e. the Literal sense and observation of the Old Law, after the New became of force, destroyeth rather than saveth the observer of it;) *but the Spirit,* (i. e. the Spiritual Law) *giveth Life.* But if the ministration of death, written and graven in Stones, was glorious, so that the Children of Israel could not stedfastly behold the face of Moses for the glory of his Countenance, which glory was to be done away. How shall not the ministration of the Spirit be rather glorious? For even that which was made glorious had no glory in this respect, by reason of the glory that excelleth. All this doth shew the great disparitie between the Law and the Gospel, and the preeminence of This above That. So, be the Law in it self, and for that season, and for that people, glorious and good; yet upon the approach of the Gospel and its being in force, all that perished and the works thereof no longer good works, much less justifying, because they were not done in Faith: not in the Faith of Christ, but in the Faith of Moses. The principal then, yea only Good works that are now of any account as to absolute acceptation at Gods hands, are those which are done in an Evangelical manner. Now the manner of acting thus Evangelically to the denomina-  
tion



tion of our works, Good, is thus described by St. Paul, *For by Grace are ye saved through Faith: and that not of your selves, it is the gift of God. Not of works, lest any man should boast. For we are his workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto Good works, which God hath before ordained that we should walk in them.* Which certainly implieth, that Grace being taken for the Gospel of Grace, in opposition to the Law, Christ in opposition to Moses, and Faith to the belief of Moses Law; we are no longer of the Old man but the New man, we are created anew in Christ, and that Good works from him, and through Faith in him, are they only that properly can be so called, and to these we are fashioned, and as it were, created by the Gospel. So that if we should describe Good works of Christians, we may call them, Acts, done in the Faith of Christ, according to the tenor of the Gospel, as a Rule directing us to the manner and End of working.

Ephes. 2. 8.  
9.  
10.

Nevertheless, though these be good, and every Good and Faithful Christian stands obliged by vertue of his Holy Faith professed, and the Covenant of Grace entred into with God under the Gospel, and the hope of obtaining the special promises of the Gospel; yet are they not in themselves Good as to the perfection prescribed by that Rule, and in Justice might be exacted by God through the ordinarily inseparable defects from humane frailty, so long as we are in this world. And how far they avail, it now follows to be examined.

## CHAP. XV.

*Of the Effect of Good Works, which is the Effect of Faith. How Works may be denominated, Good. How they dispose to Grace. Of the Works of the Regenerate. Of the proper conditions required to Good Works, or Evangelical.*

Supposing then, that there are such works which both God and man esteem Good; it is next to be sought into, how far their Goodness does extend: and of what efficacy they are, or what are the Effects of them. Remembring withall, that here, Faith is no way excluded, but advanced rather: seeing Good works being the Effects of Faith, the Effects of Good works must of necessity be likewise the Effects of Faith; as the fruit owes no less to the Root, which gives life and growth to the whole tree, than it doth to the branch from which it immediately proceeds. Yet is it here to be noted, answerable to what is said before, That all good works do not proceed from Faith. For the works of the Gentiles have a real goodness in them, and that much more than they of the Jew, as they are Jewish; and yet not done in Faith, nor attaining to the *Decorum* or perfection of the Gospel, and therefore frequently called sinful, and no ways conducing directly to salvation, or Justification, as do the works

wrought in Faith. I say directly, because as in nature a man is said to live the Life of a sensible Creature before he come to the perfection of humane nature: so may there be a preparatory or previous goodness in the works of Infidels, which may dispose to, not merit the life or form of Faith: but because the Regeneration, called sometimes the *Creation* of the New man to shew the absoluteness and independence of the Divine power and pleasure in such Acts, doth not proceed as nature doth: For that which may be as predisposing, is not simply requisite to the introducing the form of Spiritual Life: but by the most free and powerful providence, many are elected and brought to Spiritual Life, without any such previous goodness. And if we should grant natural or moral Justice were necessary as an Antecedent to Faith, it would not follow that it were so by way of merit, or disposing God to perfect that rude beginning, with the accession of his Grace. For, we are to make a necessary difference between Preparation to Grace, so much talked of. For there is a preparation of a mans self, or the Subject which is to receive this holy impression: and there is a preparation of the Agent which confers this, by moving or inclining him to such an End. I suppose the Schools, and severer assertors of the Freedom of Gods Grace, to which a man cannot by acts of nature dispose himself, do mean the latter, *viz.* that no man by any principle of nature, or habits of virtue acquired and exercised according to the Rules of Justice and wisdom, can thereby be said to have done any thing which of it self might incline God to regenerate him by his Grace. For it seems to me, keeping to the Rules and sense of Scripture, as unlikely that a Christian should be author any more of Spiritual Life, than a man is of his Natural: But no man can with any sense be said to contribute to his natural Life, no more can he to his Spiritual Life, which is commonly called the *First Grace*. But that the natural man, living soberly, justly and temperately, is not thereby in a greater readiness, and less distant from the divine Grace perfecting the same, were hard to affirm; as well considering the method that God usually takes (though not alwaies, nor is bound to any,) is to proceed, not *per saltum* (as they say) or from one extreme to another, on the suddain; but by apt gradations, as the encouragement is from hence given to immortality it self. And yet, as wood being orderly laid can never thereby merit or claim a kindling; or as a conveyance of a great Mannor being fully and fairly drawn can never deserve, nor so much as for its sake, dispose the Lord whose it is, to pass it away by setting his hand and seal to it: so neither can any fair hand of natural works induce God to conferr on a man the State of Grace. For this Passive preparedness we speak of, doth not so much as either open the eye to discover the use or benefit of Grace, nor in the least incline the Will to desire it. Now because the holy Fathers, and especially *St. Augustine* and modern Divines, do speak of the Works of the Unregenerate, as not only insufficient and imperfect, but sinful, yea sin; it is very requisite to take their true meaning: which cannot possibly be, as if they were simply evil, for then were they simply to be forborn and omitted; but Synecdochically, they intend alwaies to intimate a sinfulness in defect, of what was due to such Actions, compared with the divine Rule. Or they called them Sin, not so much from the nature of the Actions themselves, as the inseparable evil of Commission alwaies accompanying them; as was Pride and presumption upon their such laudable works; as sufficing of themselves without a Saviour or Sanctifier Extraordinarie, which they were either wholly ignorant of, or contemptuously rejected, to intitle them to exact

Philosophers, and observers of the law of Nature, who in the blessedness of a man in this life consisted, according to them; and afterward to open the door of a Paradise framed to themselves. Of these Good works thus mischievously attended, as constantly they were in Natural men, truly might be said by St. *Austine* on the Psalms, *Good works without Faith do but help men to go faster out of the way.* And by *Chrysostom* sometimes speaking more than enough of the use of works preparatory, *Nothing without Faith is Good, and that I may use such a Similitude as this, they seem to me who flourish with good works and are ignorant of Gods worship, to be like the Reliques of dead persons finely adorned.* And the voice of Scripture is so clear, that there is no need to alledge the same against the inefficacie of the best natural Acts to spiritual ends and purposes.

Aug. in Psal. 31.

The more principal and useful enquiry then, is, concerning the works of the Regenerate, done upon the grounds, by the virtue, and to the proper ends of Faith, what they may avail a true Believer. For that they are beneficial, and that most of all to the benefactor himself, Man, is in a manner consented to unanimously: or if it be not, we shall make no great scruple plainly and stoutly to affirm so much, after the holy Scriptures have so clearly and positively delivered the same; as amongst many in these places, *Finally brethren whatsoever things are true, whatsoever things are honest, whatsoever things are just, whatsoever things are pure, whatsoever things are lovely, whatsoever things are of good report, if there be any virtue, if there be any praise, think on these things. Those things which ye have both received, and learned, and heard, and seen in me, do; and the God of peace shall be with you.* And Heb. 6. 8. *For the earth which drinketh in the rain that cometh oft upon it, and bringeth forth Herbs meet for them for whom it is dressed, receiveth blessing from God: But that which beareth Thorns and Briars is rejected, and is nigh unto cursing, whose end is to be burned.* Who sees not here, that a good Christian, fruitful in good works, is compared to good ground, which is blessed of God; and evil Christians barren and unfruitful, compared to ill ground, next to cursing? And elsewhere, *This I say, he that soweth [the seed of good works] sparingly, shall reap sparingly: but he that soweth bountifully, shall reap bountifully.* And the Psalmist agreeable hereunto, saith, *Unto thee O Lord belongeth mercy, for thou renderest to every man according to his works.* And *Jeremie* rendereth it as a reason of Gods greatness, which is an inseparable and essential attribute of God, that he is so equal in this case; saying, *Great in Counsel, mighty in work: For thine eyes are open upon all the wayes of the Sons of men, to give every man according to his wayes, and according to the fruit of his doings.* And yet more plainly, St. *Paul* to the Romans speaking of God: *Who will render every man according to his deeds, to them who by patient continuing in well doing, seek for glory and honour, and immortality, eternal life: But unto them that are contentious and do not obey the truth, but obey unrighteousness, indignation and wrath, tribulation and anguish to every soul of man that doth evil, of the Jew first and also of the Gentile. But glory, honour, and peace, to every man that worketh good, to the Jew first, and also to the Gentile.* I shall add but one more Text, and that found in the Epistle to *Titus*, which not only in sense but almost in terms proves what I laid down concerning the beneficialness of good works. *This is a faithful saying, and these things I will that thou affirm constantly; That they which have believed in God, might be careful to maintain good Works: these things are good and profitable unto men.* And so far as we now urge good Works, the answer is very sufficient

Phil. 4. 8.

9.

Heb. 6. 7.

8.

2 Cor. 9. 6.

Psalm. 62. 12.

Jerem. 32. 19.

Rom. 2. 6, 7, 8, 9.

Tit. 3. 8.



Luk. 17. 10.

Psal. 16. 3.

Mat. 7. 21.

2 Tim. 2. 11, 12.

Heb. 10. 36.

Mat. 25. 34, 35, 36.

They falsify  
our Tenets  
saying, That  
we hold that  
Good works  
are not means  
of Salvation.  
Francis White  
Epist. Dedic.

sufficient to that place alledged against the Effect of good Works in general; where our Saviour saith in St. Luke, *And when ye shall have done all things which are commanded you, say, We are unprofitable servants: We have done that which was our duty to do.* To this, I say, it is fully answered (though more might be said,) We are unprofitable to God our Master, who commanded us to work: for so saith David likewise, *My Goodness extendeth not to thee:* but it is not said, We are unprofitable unto our selves, or, that no good accreth unto our selves thereby. And I would to God that though no good Christian can deny the usefulness of Good works in general, that do not denie the Scriptures or common sense, yet they would be more firmly settled in the belief hereof than too many are, and suffer this Faith to have its proper influence upon their lives, which might be safely admitted, and that without any offense or prejudice to the freeness of Gods grace, as will yet further appear.

For the Effect of Good works doth not only confine it self to certain temporal blessings of this world, and outward prosperities, which in truth was the proper portion and promise made by God to the Jew, under the Old Law (so far as it was Ritual and Mosaical) upon their obedience; but it extendeth it self plainly to the spiritual blessings upon earth, and immortal in heaven, as our blessed Lord expressly teaches us in his Sermon on the mount, saying, *Not everyone that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the Kingdom of heaven: but he doth the will of my Father, which is in Heaven:* that he shall, is to make no criminal addition to Scripture, the sense being so plain. And so St. Paul to Timothy teaches. *It is a faithful saying, If we be dead with him, we shall also live with him. If we suffer, we shall also reign with him.* And is it not certainly implied that we shall receive the promises of God, which are as well of Eternal and Spiritual things, if we do the will of God by Faith and works of Faith, when it is said, *Ye have need of patience, that after ye have done the will of God, ye might receive the promise?* And I should wonder at the subtilty of Perversers of divine Writ, if they shall be able to draw any other sense from the words of Christ expressing his Rule of proceeding at the day of Judgment, thus, *Come ye blessed of my Father, inherit the Kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world. For I was an hungred, and ye gave me meat; I was thirsty, and ye gave me drink; I was a stranger, and ye took me in; Naked, and ye clothed me; I was sick, and ye visited me; I was in prison, and ye came unto me.* How can any thing be spoken more plainly to make Eternal Life the reward of Good works, than is here spoken? Or how can any man affirm that all things necessary to salvation are plainly taught and easily to be understood in Scripture, and shall denie this to be plain, and such good works as are here specified, necessarie to salvation? For to bring in any Scholie which shall elude this, will do them much more mischief in other cases, as leading to the corrupting all places of Scripture, which they allow to be plain, and rendring them altogether useles to the ends for which they are alledged. For, to say only that Faith must be here understood, is most true, but insufficient to make the testimonie void; because otherwise, they were not good works. And this must alwayes be retained in memory which we have before laid as a foundation, That they are not the good works of natural Reason; or humanity, nor the good works of the Law now voided which we here in this dispute contend for; but they are the works of Faith qualified with all the due conditions of the Gospel of Grace, and actuated by the Spirit of Grace.

And

And here it may be useful to instance in some of those principal adjuncts which make our works truly evangelical and leading to that blessed end spoken of. And here I do not make Faith so properly a condition, as a cause and a common *Essential* foundation supposed to all Evangelical Acts: as the root is not aptly termed a Condition of the fruit, but the intrinsique Cause thereof. But others there are very necessarie though not in the same degree: such as these; First, that they be done in obedience to the will and command of Almighty God ordaining Good works; *A new commandment, saith Christ, I give unto you, that ye love one another.* And how far this extends St. Paul tells us, saying, *He that loveth another hath fulfilled the Law.* And yet more expressly to the Ephesians he saith, *We are Gods workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good works, which God hath before ordained that we should walk in them.* And again to the Thessalonians, he saith, *This is the will of God, even your sanctification.* Secondly, the merits of Christs Passion, whereby we are redeemed to God, and sanctified according to St. Paul to Titus speaking of Christ, *Who gave himself for us, that he might redeem us from all iniquitie, and purifie unto himself a peculiar people, zealous of Good works.*

John. 13. 24.

Rom. 13. 8.

Ephes. 2. 10.

Thes. 4. 3.

Tit. 2. 14.

A third thing requisite to constitute a work Good according to the Gospel is, that it proceed from a Person adopted or made a Child of God by Grace. For, this is required of all true Christians; That they be *born again of water and the Holy Ghost.* And as the same author elsewhere hath it, *Whoever is born of God doth not commit sin, for his seed remaineth in him and he cannot sin, because he is born of God.*

John. 3. 5.

Joh. 3. 9.

A fourth, is the inward Grace of God working and moving the mind to holy works: and this preventing us, so that we are first excited of Gods Spirit without any natural inclination of our own to do that which is the good and acceptable will of God. For to this end make our Saviours words in the Gospel, where he saith, *Without me ye can do nothing,* that is, no Good work answerable to the perfection of the Gospel, and the promises thereof.

1 Joh. 15. 5.

A fifth, is the outward Grace of God remitting and passing over the several defects and blemishes adhering to Good works, even of the Regenerate. For then (saith an holy Father truly) is the Law fulfilled, when what is committed amiss, is pardoned: And to this relate the words quoted in the Epistle to the Hebrews, as an ingredient into the Covenant of the Gospel, *viz. I will be merciful to their unrighteousness, and their sins and their iniquities will I remember no more.*

*Omnia mandata sunt soluta deputantur quando quicquid non fit agnoscitur.*  
Aug. Retract.

Heb. 8. 12.

Sixthly, Perseverance in good is likewise necessarie, though not to the essence of the Act done, to make it Good, (for perseverance doth not of it self add good or evil to an action, but supposes the same, and continues it as it finds it) yet to the reward it is absolutely necessarie. Forasmuch as Gods Judgement, as mans likewise, is alwayes passed according to what a man actually is found to be, whether good or evil, and not to what a man hath been, or possibly afterwards might have been. For, saith the word of God, *Be thou faithful unto death, and I will give thee a Crown of Life.* And elsewhere, *Waiting for the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, who shall also confirm you unto the end, that ye may be blameless unto the day of our Lord Jesus.*

Revel. 2. 10.

1 Cor. 7. 8.

Last of all, to make a good Work rewardable, is requisite the freeness of Gods promises made to accept the same, and to reward it, not for its own sake, but for his sake, and Christs sake. And that God hath promised blessed rewards to those that work according to the tenour of the Gospel!

Mat. 10. 41.

Mat. 5. 12.

Mat. 10. 42.

Luk. 6. 35.

Vort. disput.  
Select. Part. 2.  
p. 728. 726.

Gospel, as now described ; doing it as his children, under the protection of Christs mediation and merits, to the glory of God, through the operation of Gods Spirit, persevering therein, till God shall call them off; resting not upon themselves, but his promises ; is most undeniable, and a Principle necessary to be maintained and practised by all faithful Christians, doth appear from what is before alleadged. And what (if any thing may be) is yet more clearly asserted by Christ, saying, *He that receiveth a Prophet in the name of a Prophet, shall receive a Prophets reward. And he that receiveth a righteous man in the name of a righteous man, shall receive a Righteous mans reward.* And so to those that suffer for Christ, which is reputed amongst the chief of Good deeds, *Rejoyce and be exceeding glad: for great is your reward in heaven, for so persecuted they the Prophets.* And *Whoever shall give to drink unto one of these little ones a cup of cold water only in the name of a Disciple, verily I say unto you he shall in no wise lose his reward.* And in St. Luke, Christ saith, *But love your enemies and do good and lend hoping for nothing again, and your reward shall be great, and ye shall be the Children of the Highest.* For he is kind unto the unthankful and evil. Here, besides the positive promises, is added a reason to assure all that shall do good works, that great shall be their reward: *viz.* because Gods goodness and mercy is such that he imparteth of the same unto the wicked, he doth good unto the ill-deserving and shall he not much more do good to those that are good, and abound in Good works? To ascribe therefore so much to a modern notion of Faith as many do (though the Learneders favourers of it closely dealt with, are constrained to depart from this new rigour, as I could shew by divers instances) as to divide it from it self, that is, the works of Faith, from Faith ; the fountain in order to Justification, and Sanctification, and Salvation, is in effect to denie the Christian Faith, and introduce one of their own invention, to the great dishonour of God, and reproach of Christian Faith ; which consisteth in these two things principally, *Evangelical Obedience*, and a *Glorious reward.* And now lest some prejudiced mind may suppose that I have stated this point too favourably to the Roman sense, and injuriously to the Frankness of Gods grace and mercy, in relation both to our Sanctification and Justification, and also to the vertue and efficacie of Faith in order to them, I shall end this discourse with the Stating of this cause as I find it by *Vartius* a most severe and rigid Calvinist: as they call such men, in this negative way. *The Controversie therefore (said he) between us and the Papacie. First is not Whether good works are to be done ; For, we affirm it. 2. Neither whether they be necessary and profitable to salvation : we affirm both. 3. Neither whether they are pleasing to God, which we affirm. 4. Nor whether God grants a Remuneration and Reward to them. For, we affirm it, 5. Nor whether it be lawful to do good works with an eye to the reward ; We say so. 6. Nor yet whether good works are sens; we stoutly deny. 7. Nor lastly, Whether the just be worthy of a Crown ; For this we yield, with this limitation, Not out of their own worth, but the worthiness of God, &c.* And if all this be honestly and fairly agreed to, I see no reason to fear the empty cavils and vain exceptions of some men, who have run themselves they can scare well tell whether themselves, from Popery: but I may venture to tell, *Why ? viz.* Partly out of a blind implicate Faith in the Teachers they raise to themselves: and partly to save their Credit and purses by a strange and monstrous notion of Faith, rather than their souls. But the main block of Offense taken, not given, by this doctrine, seems to be an opinion of Merit favoured hereby. Of this therefore we shall speak next.

C H A P.



## CHAP. XVI.

*Of merit as an effect of Good Works, The several acceptations of the word, Merit. What is Merit properly. In what sense Christians may be said to merit. How far Good Works are Efficacious unto the Reward promised by God.*

**T**O merit is of a very various and ambiguous sense, among the Ancients humane and divine. It were superfluous to note all, and to omit all, injurious to our present design. These three are the most needful to be observed. For sometimes it is used in prophane Histories, for *Service* military; as the souldier under such a Commander, is said to merit, *Mereri*, under him. It is likewise frequently used by humane and Ecclesiastical Authors for to *obtain* or *acquire* only by just and due endeavours, without any just deserts of the Partie said to merit, but rather of Grace and favour of him who hath appointed and promised freely to reward such actions as are enjoined and assigned with such ends and remunerations, which far exceed the proportion or value of the work. For; surely in publick and antient Games (from which practice St. *Paul* hath borrowed many a Metaphor describing the service and contention of Christians in the service of God) to outrun, and prevent by footmanship, him that was matcht with one, did not properly deserve such a vast reward as was usually conferred on him who excelled his Fellow: (For what title of justice can the hasting to take a crown give to him that receives it?) yet was he said to deserve it, and that either comparatively, because he in reason ought to be preferred before any other that came behind him; and therefore merit it rather than he. Or because the Authors of such rewards having solemnly and fairly quitted all their Rights, and by publick promise settled the same upon other, upon certain conditions they shall judge fit, there is a conditional Right thereby devolved upon others: yet not out of the worthiness of the acts leading to the acquiring the same. But a third notion of merit implies such a proportion between the Act, and the end or recompence, that it were no less than unjust and unreasonable for him who is concerned in the reward to denie it to him, or detain it from him, the work being accomplished. It being a Principle of common justice what Christ pronounces as Christian reason too, *The Labourer is worthy of his hire*: i. e. he merits it. And therefore James saith well in the like case; *Behold the hire of the labourers which have reaped down your fields, which is of you kept back by fraud; crieth: and the cries of them which have reaped are entred into the ears of the Lord of Sabbath*: i. e. they crie for justice against them who are indebted to them for such service which deserve much reward.

Upon these general grounds thus premised, we shall have easier access to the difficultie of meriting in relation to God, and the reward he holdeth forth to his faithful servants. For in truth, this latter sense is scarce

*Meruit* (q' sub  
Servitio Ifau-  
rico in Cilicia,  
sed brevi tem-  
pore, &c. Suet.  
de Julio Cæ-  
sare in Vita.  
Ære merent  
parvo—Lucan.  
lib. 9.  
Vocabulum me-  
rendi apud ve-  
teres Ecclesi-  
asticos Scrip-  
tores, fere i-  
dem valet quod  
consequi, seu  
aptum idone-  
umque fieri ad  
consequendum.  
Id. Cassand.  
Schol. in  
Hymnos Ec-  
clesiasti. p. 179

Luk. 10. 7.  
Jam. 15. 4.

maintained or allowed by any Good Christian; or if it be, we shall not account it worth the expence of so much pains and time, to refute them any further than the thing it self doth, rightly considered For merit (as is said in effect) is the just right that a man hath to a thing in possession of another, there being no difference in such cases between what man enjoys, and what he doth not enjoy, but that the one is in the possession of himself, and the other, of another: both being of right his own, the one by ancient, and the other (perhaps) by modern purchase. And this is founded upon the equity of Commutative Justice, whereby one thing is exchanged for another, as labour for reward; such a commensuration of the Action of a Christian being never to be found in order to the end promised: For all that we can do, is our duty to God, and not our desert. And though God may have seem'd to have receded in some manner from his original Right over us, in that he stipulates with his servants, and Covenants with them for such immediate recompence for such light labours; yet this doth not extinguish his dominion absolute over us, nor extenuate, or bring down the value of the reward it self, so far as to ballance the account between God and man, so that they should relate to one another as do Debtor and Creditor. Because, whether man contracts or not, whether he promises or not, Justice in behalf of the Servant claims a proportionable reward: and a Debtor he is really, though perhaps Legally he be not: But between God and man there is no such natural mutual obligation, before a free promise on Gods part issued out. And therefore, after such promise made, impossible it is that any or many Acts on mans part should be commensurate to the goodness of the reward expected; but it must all depend upon favour and grace. *For, who hath prevented me* (saith God in Job) *that I should repay him?* And St. Paul to the Romans; *Now to him that worketh is the reward not reckoned of Grace, but of debt.*

Job. 41. 11.

Rom. 4. 4.

The principal enquiry then, is about the works of such as acknowledge a Freeness of promise in God, (as most, or all Christians do) what proportion they may bear to the reward so freely promised? And in truth, there seems no less then a contradiction, after an acknowledgement of the freeness of a promise infinitely exceeding the labour or work, made to impute the reward rather to the work, than to the promise. For he that cannot merit the cause absolutely required to the effect, cannot be said to merit the Effect: so that he who protests against the sufficiency of his work to merit the promise, can have no tolerable pretension to merit the effect. Hence it is that Paul saith against such as may glory in their works, *Where is boasting then? It is excluded. By what Law? Of works? Nay, But by the Law of Faith.* And yet in the two more favourable and less proper senses above specified, may a man, without prejudice to Gods free Grace, or Faith on Christ, be said to merit; there being more exotiqueness to Scripture Phrase, and harshness to ears tender of Gods free Grace, than guilt in that word. For first, who can denie that he is the servant of God (that he is) according to the vow in baptism, a Souldier of Jesus Christ; that he serves under him in the work of the Gospel, against the world, and flesh, and Devil, to the encrease of Grace and vertue according to Godliness? This is to merit many times with the ancient, without any implication of obligation upon God or Christ towards us for our service.

Rom. 3. 27.

The second acceptation then is chiefly to be discussed, which allows not only a service, but an efficacie to Good works so far as to render them capable of such a term as *Merit*. For there is a wide difference between a sufficiency

sufficiencie of a work to obtain a thing, and the efficiencie. The former indeed is absolute: The latter not so. St. Paul saying to the Corinthians, *We therefore as workers together with him*, 1. c. Cod; doth certainly impleie somewhat of activeness, and efficiency (by way, at least of Instrument) subordinate to that of God, towards the great work of advancing the Gospel: but he disavows a sufficiencie when he saith, *Who is sufficient for these things?* and when he saith, *Who then is Paul and who is Apollos, but Ministers by whom ye believed, even as the Lord gave to every man*, and so then neither is he that planteth any thing, neither he that watereth, but God that giveth the increase. No man can be a minister or instrument to another but he must act together with him. Again, No man that is an instrument or minister to another, cau intitle himself absolutely or principally to the effect. So then, supposing that upon works evangelical reward certainly follows of course, of Gods promise, yet this glory is not to be assumed to the Instrument, but Principal causes moving thereunto: which are three, principally arising and over-ruling a Christian. The inward Grace of Gods spirit in respect of man working: The Indulgence of God in remitting the rigour of the Law, according to whose exactness the work is to be, but seldom or never is performed: And the promise of God condescending to such low and favourable terms in bestowing his rewards. So that notwithstanding (as is said) there be certainly an efficacy (which sometimes the holy Fathers call merit) in Good works, there is never found a sufficiencie or such a worth in the best Christians actions, which may be commensurate to our Salvation. For though (as many of the reformed have truly spoken) we be saved by our Good works; we are not saved for our Good works; no more then being saved and Justified by our Faith we are Justified for our Faith, as shall be seen by and by.

So then, all the merit of a true Christian consists in this, That being by Faith built upon that sure and only foundation, besides which none can lay any other, neither is there any other name under Heaven whereby a man may be saved; Christ Jesus, this Faith is so active and operative in holy works proceeding from it, that the Person is qualified thereby, according to the frankness of Gods Covenant made with him in Christ, to become capable of the benefit and end of the Covenant, *Viz.* More Grace here, and fruition of Glory hereafter. For notwithstanding a the sufferings [no not of Martyrdom for Christ] of this life, are not worthy (of themselves, nor indeed by the accession of Gods Grace) to be compared to the glory to be revealed; yet may they be a means, and a way leading to the same. And though, b *We are saved, Not by Works of Righteousness, which we have done, but according to his mercy, by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the holy Ghost*; Yet this we are not capable of so freely, but c *by Faith working by Love*. Which moveth the Apostle to exhort us thus, d *My beloved as ye have always obeyed, not as in my presence onely, but now much more in my absence, work Out your own salvation with fear and trembling*. And lest any man should conceive amiss of the Grace of God, as perfecting all things without our concurrence; or should presume so far of his own strength as to judge himself able of himself to effect that, it is most wisely and seasonably added; e *For it is God that worketh in you both to will and to do of his good pleasure*. Whence it is that Eternal life is termed expressly, f *The gift of God*. Nay moreover, the means conducing hereunto next under God, is acknowledged owing unto God, by the same Apostle to the Ephesians; g *For by Grace are ye saved, through Faith; and that not of your selves, it is the*

2 Cor. 6. 1.

2 Cor. 2. 16.  
1 Cor. 3. 5.

7.

Non est tamen  
alicuius n. e  
arrogans si e-  
tiam David  
remuneratio-  
nem a Domi-  
no Deo suo pro  
egregia labori-  
bus posulet.  
F. a. gauria  
est f. d. i. a. gne  
justitie de Do-  
mini favore  
mercedem u-  
surpare. Am-  
bros. in Psal.  
119. 1.

Et tamen si  
bene cogites  
ipse dedit fi-  
dem: primo  
qua cum pro-  
misi, non  
enim de tuo  
promeristi ut  
tibi aliquid  
deberetur, &c.  
Aug. Tract.  
3. in Joan.

Ipsa vita æ-  
terna quæ uti-  
que in fine sine  
fine habebitur,  
ergo ideo meri-  
tis præceden-  
tibus redditur,  
quia ea merita  
quibus red-  
ditur non a  
nobis parata  
sunt per no-  
stram sufficien-  
tiam, sed in no-  
bis facta per  
gratiam etiam  
ipsa Gratia  
nuncupatur,  
non ob aliud  
nisi quia gra-  
tis datur. Aug.  
Ep. 105. 4.  
a Rom. 8. 1.  
b Tit. 3. 5.  
c Gal. 5. 6.  
d Phil. 2. 12.  
e v. 13.  
f Rom. 6. 23.

g Eph. 2. 8, 9.



gift of God. Not of Works, least any man should boast. Yet, notwithstanding these, and many other places of holy Scripture magnifying the grace of God, are not Works of Faith excluded any more then Faith it self, from their proper vertue in obtaining the promises. For still the reward is not of *Debt*, but of *Mercy*, as some of late distinguish; and yet it is not so of mercy, as, that Justice, subsequent and conditional to the promise, should be wholly exploded. For, what can the Scripture else intend when it saith, *If we confess our sins he is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness*. And doth not St. Paul joyn them both together, saying, *That he might be Just, and the Justifier of him that believeth in Jesus*. Is it not here as plain as words need make it, that the Apostle concerneth the justice of God in the justification of him that believeth? How then can these be reconciled, but by distinguishing a twofold Justice in God, in reference to the work of Man: An absolute or antecedent Justice, before his promise freely made; and a consequent conditional Justice, supposing a free stipulation made by God, which never could be deserved, neither is deserved by the completion of the terms to which Man stands obliged to God. So that St. Paul joyns them both together, thus considered, without any suspicion of contrariety: For, saith he to the Thessalonians, *It is a righteous thing* (and that is no less then just) *with God, to recompence tribulation to them that trouble you: And to you who are troubled, rest with us, &c.*

But some have said concerning the reward in such cases, as holy, faithful working, promised, that it is promised to the *Person*, and not to the *Work*. Which if it were so, as upon tryal would scarce prove so; what an evasion doth this prove? Seeing, in such cases, it is most absurd to divide and oppose those two which are inseparable. For, God neither doth reward the work without the person, neither the person without the work: but the person working, as the person believing. Therefore, when St. Paul saith in his second Epistle to Timothy, *I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the Faith*, he declareth his holy Life and good works: and when he addeth, *Henceforth there is laid up for me a Crown of Righteousness, which the Lord the Righteous* (or just Judge as the old Translation had it) *shall give me at that day, and not unto me only but unto all them also that love his appearing*; doth sufficiently implicate an inseparableness of the person from the work: and that which puts the person into a capacity of the reward or Crown, is the dutifulness of the person towards God. So that there must of necessity be a Causality in good deeds, in order to our Salvation: though considering the most vulgarousness of the word *merit*, and not the sense diluted with the abovesaid qualifications, it is both immodest and unsafe to apply the same to Acts which are Good neither for their own sake, nor for the Agents sake, but for Christs sake, and the liberal promise sake of God. So that to say, That Christ merited that we might merit, is very improperly, as well inroachingly, spoken upon the Grace of God: but to say, That Christ merited to the end we might effectually work out our Salvation, is to say no more then St. Paul intendeth in his Epistle to the Thessalonians; where he affirmeth that *God hath not appointed us to wrath: but to obtain Salvation by our Lord Jesus Christ*. And how obtain? the words going before and following, speaking of good works, sufficiently declare; and yet shall be more fully explained in the succeeding Chapter.

## CHAP. XVII.

*Of the two special Effects of Faith and Good Works wrought in Faith, Sanctification and Justification: what they are. Their Agreements and differences. In what manner Sanctification goes before Justification; and how it follows it.*

**W**E have shewed the Effect of Faith to be Good Works; we have also shewed how, and in what sense the Effect of good Works is Salvation: but there remains two other effects both of Faith and works of Faith, here to be considered, before we proceed: and they are *Sanctification* and *Justification*. For good Works are fruitful not only in reference to an ample and manifold reward, but in reference to good Works: as the Parable of our Saviour in the twenty fifth of Mathew plainly informs us: where it is said, *Then he that had received the five talents went and traded with the same and made them other five talents.* These five talents acquired to the first five, cannot be interpreted, the reward ultimate; for that is expressed afterward to be the *Joy of the Lord*: but they were the intermediate effects of the stock of Grace treasured up in the Soul, and exhorting and improving it self by the continual supplie of the Spirit of Christ, according to the doctrine of St. Paul to the Corinthians, saying, *Inasmuch that we desired Titus, that as he had begun, so he would also finish in you the same Grace also: Therefore as ye abound in every thing, in Faith, in utterance, in knowledge, and in all diligence, and in your love to us, see that ye abound in this Grace also.* Of this influence of Christs Spirit to the augmentation of Grace in the hearts of the true believers, speaketh the same Apostle to the Colossians, thus, *The Head from which all the body by joints and bands having nourishment ministered and knit together, encrease with the encrease of God.* Sanctification then may be described The Grace of God infused into the Soul of a Sinner, and purifying it by Faith: as Justification is the reputation and acceptation of a person for Just by almighty God, through the intuition of the merits and mediation of Jesus Christ: And yet more distinctly to declare their mutual agreement and difference, it will conduce much to the due understanding of them both.

First then, Justification and Sanctification agree in their Subject The true believer, the same person who is Sanctified being also Justified; and he that is Justified being Sanctified also: For so saith the prophet *Nahum* of him. *The Lord is slow to anger and great in power and will not at all acquit the wicked.* And when we find St. Paul affirming the contrary in appearance, viz. that God *justifieth the ungodly*, we are to understand him to speak not in [*Sensu composito*] in such manner that he is justified, while he is so ungodly, but in [*Sensu diviso*] a distinct sense and season, as if it had been said. Him that was once ungodly: as he seems to interpret himself in his Epistle to the

*Serva ergo  
mandata Dei.  
Sanctifica cor  
tuum ut Deus  
inhabitabit in te.  
Et quotidie  
magis de ma-  
gis invenies  
Deum. Opus  
Imperfect. in  
Mat. Him. 4.  
\* Mat. 25. 16.*

2 Cor. 8. 6.

v. 7.

Col. 2. 19.

Nahum. 1. 3.

Rom. 4. 5.

the

the Corinthians ; where having spoken of the many abominations men were subject to, he saith, *And such were some of you: but ye are washed, but ye are Sanctified, but ye are Justified in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, and by the Spirit of our God.* Secondly, Justification and Sanctification agree in their foundation, which is at least inchoate, and initial holiness. For, though no mans inherent holiness arises so high as to denominate him truly Just, or holy, for its own sake; yet both to Sanctification and Justification, is necessarily required some preparatorie and imperfect holiness, consisting principally in the Conversion of the mind to God, from sin. Thirdly, both Sanctification and Justification are alike owing to Faith, as their immediate Cause, next under Gods Spirit; as may be gathered from the prayer of Christ for his disciples: *Sanctifie them through thy truth: thy word is truth:* That is the doctrine of Faith, received. To which Faith, the effect of Sanctification is ascribed by St. Peter in the Acts, whereby the hearts of the Gentile were purified or Sanctified. Fourthly, they are both equally imputed unto us through the Righteousness of Christ. Therefore saith St. Paul to the Corinthians, *To them that are Sanctified in Christ Jesus, And to the Hebrews, it is said, We are Sanctified by the blood of the Covenant.* So that no less are we Sanctified then Justified by Christs death and merits, and the imputation of them.

But on the other side, they are distinct in some formalities ; such as these may be ; for First, the immediate cause of our Sanctification is in holy Scripture imputed to the operation and influence of the Holy Spirit, as our Justification is more properly attributed to Christ the mediator between God and man : As appeareth from St. Pauls words to the Thessalonians. *But we are bound to give thanks alwayes for you brethren beloved of the Lord, because God hath from the beginning chosen you to Salvation, through Sanctification of the Spirit, and belief of the truth.* And St. Peter. *Elect according to the foreknowledge of God the Father, and Sanctification of the Spirit unto obedience.* Thirdly, Justification looketh backward, being an absolution of the guilty, from sins formerly committed, and holding him Just : but no man is justified actually from sins which hereafter he may fall into : But Sanctification relates chiefly to the time future. For not only is a sinner by the Spirit of Regeneration and Sanctification purged from the old Leaven of sin and malice, but he becometh a *New Lump*, and unleavened ; and whereas he hath yielded his members as Instruments of unrighteousness unto sin, he doth yield himself unto God, as those that are alive from the dead. *And old things are done away in him, and all things become new.* And whosoever is (thus) *born of God* ; doth not commit sin, for his seed remaineth in him, and he cannot sin because he is born of God. Fourthly, to the Act of our Justification the will of man doth not necessarily concurr, though it dissents not, but is rather passive than Active ; but to our Sanctification is absolutely required the co-operation of the will and affections of man with the Grace of God, in all those who have attained unto the use of reason. For indeed by baptism Infants are so far Sanctified as to be freed from that hereditarie evil incident unto them, which their will concurred not to : but to actual Sanctification from those evils our wills did freely consent, actual concurrence of our wills is necessary. Fifthly, Our Justification is entire and absolute at once ; no man being partly Justified and partly not Justified, though he be partly Just and partly unjust or unholy : But no man in this Life is so perfectly Sanctified as that there wants not somewhat to consummate the same ; because Justification being altogether the Act of God, and not at all of Man,



Man, God may, and doth wholly and freely remit the guilt of sin to the penitent offender: But Man being also concerned in the Sanctification of himself, his acts are imperfect and defective, so that the effect it self partakes of the same, and so Sanctification continues imperfect. And it is not all at once, but answerable to our natural man proceedeth by degrees, *Until we all come in the unity of the Faith, and of the knowledge of the son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the Stature of the fulness of Christ:* which fulness of stature is that we are to hope for, and enjoy only in heaven. Lastly, to search no farther into this point, before Justification there must of necessity goe some degree of Sanctification, even in the opinion of such as contend most rigorously for freeness of Justification: for to make Justification altogether inconditionate, and absolute on mans part, is to blaspheme the immutable Justice of God, and withall, destroy the use of Faith in order to our Justification: For it is impossible any thing bearing the name of a cause or condition, as Faith certainly doth, when we say *We are justified by Faith*, should be posteriour to the thing it so relates unto. The promise indeed of pardon and Justification of a sinner is actually made to those who do not actually believe and repent, but promise answerably and covenant to believe, and repent: but the Execution and performance of this promise is not made before there be an actual fulfilling of our Covenant with God. But then on the other side, there must be perfect Justification before there can be that perfect Sanctification, which we all aspire unto, and God expects from us. For then are we truly Sanctified, when our works are holy and acceptable unto God, which they are not untill they proceed from a person so far justified as to be accepted of God. Whence may be resolved that doubt, about Gods acceptance of the person for the works sake, or the work for the persons sake. For wisely and truly did the wife of *Manoah* infer Gods acceptance of their sacrifice from the favour and grace he bore unto their persons: and at the same time prove the favour God bore to their persons from the Acceptance of their sacrifice, saying, *If the Lord were pleased to kill us, he would not have received a burnt-offering, and a meat-offering at our hands; neither would he have shewed us all these things, nor would, as at this time, have told us such things as these.* That God therefore accepted their Burnt-offering, it is a sign he approved their persons, but the reason antecedent of Gods acceptance of their sacrifice, was because he first approved their persons. And yet, notwithstanding the goodness of the person is the original of the goodness of the work, nothing hinders but the goodness of the work may add value, favour, and estimation unto the person. As (to use *Luthers* comparison and others after, and before him) the tree bears the fruit, and not the fruit the tree: And the goodness of the tree is the cause of the goodness of the fruit, and not the goodness of the fruit the cause of the goodness of the tree: Yet the fruit doth procure an esteem and valuation from the owner to the tree; and endears it to him, to the cultivating the ground and dressing, it and conferring much more on that than others. In like manner, the Person Sanctified and Justified produces good works, and not those good works, him: but some actions, accompanied with Gods grace, antecedent and inferiour to the fruit it self: Yet doth the fruit of good Works add much of esteem and honour from God to such a person; and render him capable of an excellent reward: for *St. Paul* to the Philippians assureth them and us, when he saith, *I desire fruit that may abound to your account.*

Eph: 4. 13.

*Non enim ut  
ferent, ignis  
cal facit, sed  
quia fervet:  
Nec ideo bene  
currit rota ut  
rotunda sit, sed  
quia rotunda.  
Aug. ad Sim-  
plic. Qu. 1.*

Judg. 13. 23.

Phil. 2. 7.

## CHAP. XVIII.

*Of Justification as an Effect of Faith and Good Works. Justification and Justice to be distinguished, and How. The several Causes of our Justification. Being in Christ, the Principal Cause. What it is to be in Christ. The means and manner of being in Christ.*

**T**O the informing our selves aright in the much controverted point of Justification, (which whether it be a proper effect of Good works or not, doth certainly bear such a relation to them as may well claim this place to be treated of) it seemeth very expedient, after we have distinguished, and illustrated it by Sanctification explained, to proceed to distinguish it likewise from Justice. For as Righteousness or holiness, the ground of Sanctification, is to be distinguished from Sanctification it self, so is Justice the ground to be distinguished from Justification its complement, and perfection: This being omitted or confusedly delivered by diverse, hath been no small cause of great obscurities. For, Righteousness or Justice seems to be nothing else but an exact agreement of a mans actions in general to the true Rule of Acting, and that Rule is the Law or word of God. For he that offends not against that, is undoubtedly a just man of himself, by his own works, and needs nothing but Justice to declare and acknowledge him for such, no mercy, nor favour. As that thing which agrees with the square or Rule is perfect. But notwithstanding such supposed perfect conformitie to the Law of God be perfect righteousness, yet is not this to be Justified: Neither can any man in Religion be said more to Justifie himself, than in civil cases: where it is plainly one thing to be innocent, and to be an accurate, unproveable observer of the Law in all things, and to have sentence pronounced in his behalf, that so indeed he really is: For this is only to Justifie him: though in pleading his own case, in clearing and vindicating himself, a man is vulgarly said to Justifie himself. And no otherwise, if we will keep to the safe way of proper and strict speaking, is it in Religion. Supposing that which never happen'd since Christ, that a man should have so punctually observed every small, as well as great precept of Gods Law, that no exception could be taken against him, yet is he not hereby Justified, though he may be said to be the true Cause of his Justification, and that he hath merited it. Which St. Paul seems to implicate untous saying, *For I know nothing by my self yet am I not hereby Justified.* For in truth, Justification is an act of God only, as Judge, no less then author of his own Laws, upon the intuition of due Conformitie to it, or Satisfaction of it.

1 Cor. 4. 4.

And, as a man may possibly be just and yet never be justified (taking things abstractly;) so may a man be unjust and guilty and yet be justified: doth not the word of God, as well as common reason and experience, certifie so much? *He that Justifieth the wicked, and he that condemneth the Just, even they*

Prov. 17. 15.

*they both are abomination unto the Lord.* This then surely may be. No man then can be justified by himself, or any Act, or Acts of him, no not through Christ.

But though he cannot thus Judicially and formally Justifie himself, it is not so repugnant to reason or Scripture to be said *Materially* and *Causally* to act towards his Justification. Nay, he cannot come up to the rigour of the Rule, nor excel so far in Justice and holiness, as to demand at Gods hands, his absolving sentence: yet that he cannot contribute towards it, is not only false, but dangerous doctrine leading men into a sloathfull dependence, and despair, so that they shall do nothing at all, because they cannot do all that is required of Justice.

But to arrive in this doubtful and perplexed way to the right end of this Dispute, it will be necessarie to pass briefly through all the several Causes of our Justification, and so much the rather, because divers before have so done, and failed in their Divinity, because of a mistake in Logick, in miscalling Causes. And first we must know otherwise then some have taught, That the Material Cause of our Justification is not the graces in us, nor the pardon without us; nor remission of sins, nor obedience of Christ, nor of our selves; but the person justified is the subject of Justification. For who with good sense can say, *Our sins are justified*, our good works are Justified? True it is St. Paul saith, *by him (Christ) all that believe are justified from all things, from which ye could not be Justified by the Law of Moses*: Shewing hereby, that we are Justified from our sins: but not that our sins are Justified. And so where St. James speaks so often (of which hereafter) that we are Justified by Works, he intendeth not to say our Works are Justified. For tis the person, not the qualities of him, that is Justified. And if any speak otherwise, they must be helpt out by recurring to Figurative not proper speaking. In such cases as these, if ever we would judge aright, we must hold as precisely as can be to propriety of speech.

Acts. 13. 39.

About the Final cause of our Justification, I find nothing singular, but in common with all the Acts of God towards man: and all the Actions of Man towards God, *viz, The glory of God.* Neither is there any difference of parties herein.

But concerning the Formal Cause of our Justification before God, some discord is found; yea concerning a *Formal Cause*, in General, what it is; and wherein it consisteth; which is very necessarie to be understood to attain to the true notion of being Formally Justified. A Formal Cause then is that whereby a thing is, what it is; subsists in it self, and is distinguished from other things; being always essential and intrinsecal to the thing, so by it constituted, that it cannot be so much as conceived without it, and cannot possibly but be, with it. This, whether artificial or not, I weigh not much; but is a true description of that Cause. For instance sake, A man is a man properly by his soul, and not by his body, his soul being his Inward form; and as it is impossible that he should be so without it, so is it impossible but that he should be so, with it; whatever outward visible defects or imperfections may appear otherwise. So in the present cause, it must necessarily be, that the *Formal Cause* of our Justification be intrinsecal to the Justified person; and that not being, that he should not be justified: Contrary to what some have affirmed upon this occasion; who from an instance of an Eclipse, would show that the formal Cause is not always intrinsecal to that which it formeth. For, say they (as it should seem by the authority of *Zabarel*) In an Eclipse of the Sun, the Moon interposing, is the

K

formal



Justification  
is neither--but  
a certain ac-  
tion in God  
applied unto  
us, or a cer-  
tain respect  
or relation  
whereby we  
are acquit of  
our sins,  
and accepted  
to life everla-  
sting. *Perkins*  
*Gal. 2. 16.*  
*Rom. 8. 30.*

*Phil. 3. 9.*

formal Cause of the Darknes of the Earth, and yet it is not intrinsecal to it, but separate. But the mistake is plain; that the Moon being not the cause of the earth it self, but of the darknes of the earth only, it is not the Formal Cause of that, and so may be extrinsecal to it, and intrinsecal to the darknes, as the formal cause: but whether this be so or not, we are here only to show that no cause formal can be external to the thing of which it is the form; and by consequence, that nothing without us can be the formal cause of our Justification, or that whereby we are denominated Just before God: So that neither Christ, nor his merits do render us so Justified. And therefore, they who to magnifie the mystery of our Justification do object to themselves, How a man can be Just, by the justice of another, and how righteous by another persons righteousness, any more than a man can hear with another mans ears, or see with another mans eyes; do tie such a knot as they can by no means loose. For in plain truth, neither the one nor the other can formally be. But they may say, As it is Christs righteousness indeed and rests only in him, so we cannot be said to be justified formally by it but as it is made ours especially by Faith, and is applied unto us, so we may be formally Justified by it. To which I say, that if that individual formal Righteousness which is in Christ were by any means so transferred formally unto us and infused into us, that we should in like manner possess it, as did Christ; then indeed the argument would hold very good, that by such application we were Justified formally by Christs righteousness: but no such thing will be granted, neither is any such thing needfull. For, though the Scripture saith directly that Christ is *The Lord our righteousness*, and St. Paul desireth to be found in Christ not having his own righteousness which is of the Law, but that which is through the Faith of Christ, the righteousness which is of God by Faith. Yet we are not to understand hereby that the formal righteousness of Christ becomes our formal Righteousness; but that he is, by the Gospel he revealed unto us, the teacher of Righteousness, and that far different from that Righteousness of the Law, which St. Paul calls his own, as that which he brought with him to Christ: and he is the Prime Cause of our Righteousness, sending his holy Spirit unto us, and by his merits appeasing the wrath of God, and satisfying his Justice for us: all which is not the formal cause of our Righteousness or Justification. For neither is that formal righteousness in us, which is inherent Righteousness, the formal Cause of our Justification. But our Justification formal, is an Act of God terminating in Man, whereby he is absolved from all guilt, reputed Just, and accepted to Grace and favour with God. When God hath actually passed this divine, free and gracious sentence upon a sinner, then, and not before, is he formally Justified. This is the end and consummation of all differences between God and man; and the initiating him into all saving Grace here, and Glory hereafter: as St. Paul writing to the Romans witnesseth in these words, *Whom he predestinated them he also called; and whom he called, them he also Justified; and whom he justified, them he also glorified.*

## CHAP. XIX.

## Of the Efficient Cause of Justification.

**I**T remains therefore now that we proceed to the means, causes and motives, inducing God Almighty thus to Justifie Man a sinner; whom he might rather condemn for his unrighteousness. And these, as many and divers in kind, as they are, may all be reduced unto the Efficient causes so often mistaken for the formal. And truly, to proceed herein regularly and clearly, we must begin with the Cause of all Causes, God himself. For though Christ be the Cause of all Causes visible, and in the actual administration and execution; yet he is not the first, but subordinate Cause of Mans reconciliation to God, his Justification and Salvation. For as holy *Chrysostom* divinely and sublimely enquiring into the reason that might incline God to restore Man being fallen, and lost by his Apostasy from God; unto a state of bliss again; to admit of any terms of Reconciliation with him; determines it, it is nothing but the divine Philanthropie of God, his free, undeserved, unscrutable love towards man, springing, (as it were,) from his own breast, beginning within himself, and of himself absolutely, irrespectively to any outward motives, but to show as *St. Paul* saith, *He would have mercie on whom he would have mercie, and he would have compassion on whom he would have compassion:* and because as the Psalmist hath it, *Whatsoever the Lord pleased, that did he in heaven and in earth, in the seas, and in all deep places.* He pleased to leave the fallen Angels, and he pleased to restore fallen man; and that because it so pleased him. For not so much as any consideration of Christ could dispose him to decree so favourably on the behalf of man: but first, this decree passed, and then followed the determination of the means, most convenient thereunto: which was, to send his son, to give him to be Incarnate and to be the great and powerful Mediator between God and Man; mighty to save. Christ then was that which in general moved God Externally to the Justification of Man, after he had conceived of himself a purpose to reconcile man to himself; as *S. Paul* clearly asserteth in his second Epistle to the Corinthians, *All things are of God who hath reconciled us to himself, by Jesus Christ, and hath given to us the ministry of reconciliation. To wit, that God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them, and hath committed unto us the word of reconciliation.* And more particular'y elsewhere, he describeth unto us the several parts of our reconciliation to God, saying, *But of him are ye in Christ Jesus, who of God is made unto us wisdom and righteousness, Sanctification and redemption.* Therefore it is, that so often in Scripture Christ is called a Mediator between God and man; for the bringing to pass, and causing to take effect, the General decree of God for the redemption of Mankind. For through Christ we were by God predestinated, as is taught us by *St. Paul* to the Ephesians, *Having predestinated us unto the adoption of Children by Jesus Christ unto himself, according to the good pleasure of his will.* Where we see plainly, that Christ was not the Cause that we were predestinated in Christ, but the Good pleasure of his Absolute will. Again, we were

πιστιν δι-  
τως αγα-  
πην ο Θεος  
πρὸς ἡμᾶς  
ἡμεῖς οὐκ ἐ-  
ξ ἐμαυτῶν  
ἐγενήθημεν  
ἀγαπῶντες  
αὐτόν.  
*Chrys. Hom.*  
27. in *Joan.*  
*Rom. 9. 15.*

*Psal. 135. 6.*

2 Cor. 5. 13.

19.

1 Cor. 1. 30.

*Gal. 3. 20.*

*Heb. 8. 6.*

1 Tim. 2. 5.

*Heb. 9. 15.*

*Heb. 12. 24.*

*Eph. 1. 5.*

Jud. 1.

Phil. 3. 9.

Rom. 3. 23, 24, 25.

Heb. 7. 25.

Heb. 4. 14.

called in Christ, as St. *Jude* implieth, saying, *To them that are sanctified by God the Father, and preserved in Jesus Christ, and called.* And as we are called and sanctified, so certainly are we justified freely by Christ. And there is nothing more requisite for us to be fully justified in the presence of God, then to be made partakers of Christ: and, as St. *Paul* saith, *To be found in Christ, not having our own righteousness, which is of the Law, [whether of Nature or Moses] but that which is through the Faith of Christ, the righteousness which is of God by Faith.* From whence, and several other texts of Holy Scripture testifying the absolute necessity of Christ to the Justifying and saving of us, it appeareth that nothing can be more contrary to the Eternal purpose of saving man through Christ, yea nothing indeed more ridiculous, then to but imagine that there can be any Act in man contradistinct from Christ, and not receiving all its worth and vertue from Christ, which can avail any thing towards the salvation or Justification of him: Or that a man being grafted into Christ, and partaking of his graces and merits, can fail of being accepted of God unto Justification, and salvation. For as St. *Paul* saith to the Romans, *All have sinned and come short of the glory of God: Being justified freely by his grace, through the redemption that is in Jesus Christ, whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through Faith in his blood, to declare his Righteousness for the Remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God, &c.* Now there are three things in General which truly denominate us to be in Christ, and partakers of him: To be partakers of the benefit of his Passion satisfying for us: To be partakers of his spirit, and graces thereof renewing and sanctifying us: and thirdly, to be partakers of his Intercession before God on our behalf. For as the Scripture tells us, *He ever liveth to make intercession for us.* And this his intercession, an Act of his Sacerdotal office, is it whereby Christ properly meriteth for us. For the Passion of Christ doth sufficiently discharge us of our former Obligations and obnoxiousness to the Law of God, and the punishments therein denounced against the contemners and violaters thereof; and so may be said, having fully satisfied all the Law justly demanded of us, to have merited pardon and remission of what is passed, doth not thereupon entitle us to any graces or blessings from God, but yet putteth us into a capacity of them; but the actual collation of them is rather owing unto the uncessant mediation of him before God in behalf of us. And this the Scripture intends, when it saith, *We have a great high Priest that is passed into the Heavens, Jesus the son of God.* And thus we have made a second step towards the clearing our Justification in its Efficient Causes, viz, That it is wholly effected by Christ made righteousness sanctification and Redemption unto us.

But a third thing and that of no mean necessity and difficulty both, is behind, how we come to be so entirely partakers of Christ, how Christ so becomes ours as that God should upon the intuition hereof freely Justifie us? For as St. *Austin* hath observed of the giving of the Holy Spirit of God to those that ask aright (whereas none can ask aright but by the Holy Spirit,) herein is a great mysterie that a man can be said to be capable of the Spirit before he hath the Spirit: In like manner, can no man be said to be capable of Christ and his Benefits, before he be in some manner actually in Christ. For if all our works are Sanctified by Gods Spirit, and acceptable to God, only as they are done in Christ; how can any such Acts lead us unto Christ, or make us capable of him, seeing it is one of the greatest perfections and excellencie of good Works, or Faith (for unless it, and

we



we be in Christ, it cannot be a saving Faith. i. e. leading us to Salvation) to make us effectual partakers of, and one with him?

These difficulties constrain us to distinguish both Faith and being in Christ into (I cannot say properly, two kinds as) two eminent Periods, and Degrees of Faith, and being in Christ. The one is initial, and preparatory as a foundation; which is not a distinct building from the house finished and furnished, but a part of it; and material Cause thereof. The other is consummate and formed: yet not so, but addition of perfection, though not of Parts, may be made; all mens Faith being capable of farther degrees in this life. And from hence that mystical sense of our Saviours words in St. *Johns* Gospel, may both give, and receive illustration. For in the sixth of *John*, Christ hath these words, *No man can come unto me except the Father which hath sent me draw him.* And in the fourteenth of *John* he saith, *I am the way, and the truth, and the life; no man cometh unto the Father but by me.* Teaching us, That notwithstanding, God is the First cause to bring us to be in Christ, and that by his Predestination before time, and his Calling and Electing us in time, to the knowledge and Faith in Christ, yet he is not reconciled unto us; he doth not pardon us, nor justify us, before Christ brings us unto him: and offers us to him as a new lump, and as capable of his grace and favour, which obtained, we are then truly justified by Christ.

*Joh. 6. 44.*

*Joh. 14. 6.*

And as there are two distinct acts of God, the one of his good Providence in bringing us to the Covenant made with mankind in Christ; and the other of his special Grace in accepting us through Christ, being in the Covenant; So are there two principal Periods (as I said) of being in Christ: and the First is when we are taken within the Covenant of the Gospel of Grace, by baptism; whereby we are made members of Christs mystical Body and inheritours of the Kingdom of Heaven. Not that immediately and necessarily, All baptized persons are sure to go to heaven, but all baptized persons are thereby put into a capacity and Right to heaven. To this St. *Paul* to the Galatians gives us his fair suffrage, saying, For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ. And the same is implied in this his salutation: *Salute Andronicus and Junias my kinsmen and my fellow Prisoners, who are of note among the Apostles, who also were in Christ, before me.* Where doubtless these persons are said to be in Christ, before St. *Paul*, because they were baptized, and made profession of Christ, before St. *Paul*. And so when he speaks of *the Churches of Judea which are in Christ* he meaneth no more than such who were become, of Jews, Christians in Judea; not intending that every one who so professed Christ should be infallibly Justified and saved by Christ, as they shall who are arrived to the more perfect state of being in Christ; of which the Apostle thus speaketh to the Colossians; *Whom [Christ] we preach, warning every man, and teaching every man in all wisdom, that we may present every man perfect in Christ Jesus.*

*Gal. 3. 27.*

*Rom. 16. 7.*

*Gal. 1. 22.*

*Col. 1. 28.*

Now what is, or wherein this perfection in Christ doth consist, is I suppose past any mans apprehension or Judgement precisely to determine; that is, what degree of holiness in Christ, God will accept to our Justification: but in general these two States of a Christian are plainly described thus by St. *Paul* to the Corinthians, *If any man be in Christ Jesus, he is a new creature.* Where being a new Creature, and being in Christ, are distinguished as Cause and Effect: our being in Christ Jesus being the reason and cause of becoming New creatures. So that we may well observe in this case a two-fold Conversion requisite to make a man truly in Christ. A conversion to Christ, by renouncing false Religions, and false opinions of a Deity, and assenting

*2 Cor. 5. 17.*

Acts 15. 3.

Gal. 2. 20.

assenting to, and embracing the doctrine according to Godliness. This every man doth, who takes on him the name, profession, and initiating Sacrament of a Christian: of this is to be understood what is spoken of the conversion of the Gentiles. And this conversion is rather (to speak properly) a conversion to the truth of Godliness, than to true Godliness; Or a conversion to the Truth of Faith, rather than to the life of Faith: of which St. Paul to the Galatians, *The life which I now live in the flesh, I live by the Faith of the Son of God, who loved me and gave himself for me.* The sum then of all this, is this, That to be in Christ effectually, to our Justification and Salvation, is so to be converted unto him as to believe the Faith of Christ and to Live the life of Christ.

This being cleared, nearer access is made unto the solution of the prime Doubt; which is, What is that which so far and fully enacteth us in Christ, that thereupon God doth freely justify us? For it is now supposed and granted that our so being in Christ making us partakers of the merits, mediation, and Righteousness of Christ, doth immediately and absolutely qualify to Justification: and secondarily, that which brings us into Christ may properly enough be said to be it whereby we are justified. And here comes in the grand dispute about the vertue of Faith, Whether that only, and wholly performeth this? For in what sense Faith may be said to bring us unto Christ, or thus to lay hold (as they say) of Christ, in the same may it be truly affirmed that, next under God and Christ, we are justified by it.

This I know not how it can be effected better, then by the help of a most obvious and necessary, but most neglected distinction of the use and notion of Faith in holy Scripture; omitting that threefold Faith above-mentioned, and several others impertinently invented and ill employed in this case. For Faith is taken in Scripture either *Complexly* and Generally for the whole Body of Christian divinity, and Graces contained in the New testament: Or it is taken *Simply*, and distinctly, for a special Grace separate (I mean in nature not in Operation) from Hope and Charity, which together constitute the three Theological Graces. Instances of the former have been given already in the twelfth Chapter, and need not here be repeated in particular. For let any man of common equity and understanding, weigh the subject and end of all St. Pauls Epistles to the Romans, to the Colossians, to the Galatians, to the Hebrews especially (not excluding the other,) where he most expressly and zealously urges Faith against works, and he shall soon perceive that his intention and drift is, not absolutely to oppose works of Faith to the doctrine or Grace of Faith, but the works of the Law; which infirmer Christians, newly entred into the Faith of Christ, had so venerable an opinion of, that they imagined Christ could profit nothing without the works either Ceremonial or Moral of the Law of Moses. For whereas they for instance, depended absolutely on Circumcision, for their Justification, and thought that without so sacred and solemn a Rite, they could not be profited by Christ himself; St. Paul on the other side, resolutely and positively determineth thus, *Behold I Paul say unto you that if you be circumcised Christ shall profit you nothing.* And presently after, *Christ is become of no effect unto you, whosoever of you are justified by the Law: ye are fallen from Grace.* Can any thing be more manifest then here it is, that Grace is opposed to the Law? And that to trust in that, is to fall from Christ? And when it followeth, *We through the Spirit wait for the hope of righteousness by Faith;* is it not as plain as need be, that Faith is here taken for that doctrine (and not Act) of Faith, whereby men are instructed in Christ, believe in Christ, adhere

Gal. 5. 2.

v. 4.

v. 5;

to him, relinquishing the imperfect and antiquated doctrine of the Law, and its practices; which by St. Paul are all called *Flesh* in opposition to the spiritual worship of the Gospel: as to the Philippians, *For we are the Circumcision, which worship God in the Spirit, and rejoice in Christ Jesus, and have no confidence in the flesh. Though I might also have confidence in the flesh, &c.* Phil. 3. 3. And to the Romans, *But now the Righteousness of God without the Law is manifested* (that is, surely now is the doctrine of Righteousness published through Christ, without the Law) *being witnessed by the Law and the Prophets. Even the righteousness of God, which is by faith of Jesus Christ, unto all and upon all that believe.* And verse the twentieth, *By the deeds of the Law there shall no flesh be justified, &c.* Rom. 3. 21. And verse the twenty seventh, the Antithesis, or opposition doth most evidently declare the Apostles intention. *Where is boasting then? It is excluded, By what Law? Of Works? Nay, but by the Law of Faith.* The Law of Works then is the Law of Moses, and the Law of Faith is the Law of Christ. And to be *justified by Faith in Jesus*, of which immediately before, is to be understood of the whole Covenant of Grace or Faith, which is made to us in Christ Jesus, and revealed in the Gospel as contradistinct to that Covenant of Works given by Moses: and not of any special Grace or Act of Faith, as Faith is sometimes distinguished from other Evangelical Graces. 22. 20i 27;

It may be said that the works of the Law are excluded expressly, and therefore no competition is to be made between them and Faith, in the case of our Justification. To which my answer is, That though I grant, that not only the works of the Law, though moral, do not justify, but not the works of Faith, of themselves; yet I may confidently say, None of these places commonly alledged by the Exalters of Faith, and Depressors of Good works, to null the merits of works done even in Faith of Christ, do, according to the literal meaning, really perform so much: yet I rather choose to affirm, That the works excluded by St. Paul are not works of the Law moral, so much as Mosaical. For the morality of the Old Law was not properly, of Moses, but the Ceremonial only, and consequently the Law from these taking its denomination of *Mosaical*, when works of the Law are mentioned in the New Testament, we are to understand *Mosaical Works*, rather than Moral: but not at all works of Faith. So that, whatsoever is contended or pretended, our being justified freely by Grace, and justified (again) by Faith do not at all deny our Justification by works of Faith, or that the efficiency of such a Faith is quite of another nature from that of works done in Faith.

But yet it is plain from the whole design of the Epistle of St. James, the second Epistle of St. Peter, the Epistle of St. Jude, that divers of Old did so mistake St. Paul as of late dayes he hath been understood: which moved St. Austin to say directly that these Epistles were on purpose contrived and published to obviate such a misconstruction of the Blessed Apostle, as if he had intended, when he often says, *We are justified by Faith only*, a separate notion of Faith from works and effects of Faith: which was far from him; from whence we have a very compendious, solid and clear reconciliation of St. James his Epistle especially with those of St. Paul. For, as is shewed already, certain it is, that it being his principal end to oppose, and void the pretensions of the Jews to Justification without believing in Christ, or as a more moderate sort of them weak in the Faith of Christ, admitting no sufficiency in Christ to justify them without a *dash*, as least of Moses's Law; he declared freely for an absolute sufficiency in the Faith of Christ, to justify and save such as believe in him. This doctrine of St. Paul was quite mistaken

Rom. 3. 24.  
Gal. 2. 16.

*Quoniam hæc opinio fuerit exorta [ sine operibus justificari hominem] aliæ Apostolicæ Epistolæ Petri, Joannis, Jacobi, Judæ, contra eum maxime dirigunt intentionem, ut vehementer adstruant fidem sine operibus nihil prodesse; &c. Aug. de Fide & Operibus. c. 14.*



James. 2. 14.  
17.

taken by some who supposed that the act of believing, simply taken, or the Grace of Faith specially used was it whereby they were in a certain way of being justified, leaving out the fruits and effects of that lively Faith, and making it a dead Faith, as St. James calleth it : who thus argueth against such a fond and dangerous presumption, *What doth it profit, my brethren, though a man say he hath Faith, and have not works; can Faith save him? Faith without works is dead.* For the use and end of knowledge and Faith being only obedience, and a life according to Faith; what a monstrous and ridiculous thing would it be, to divide the Cause from the effects proper to it?

But it is usually replied, No, God forbid we should divide Faith from good Works. Where there is true justifying Faith, there will be, there must be good works : and that for several other reasons, but not for our justification. This is most true, wherever there is a justifying Faith there will be good Works, but what do they there in order to justification? Just as much as the fair gay train of a Peacock to the bird that draws it after it, make a fine show, and that is all that we know of. But the difficulty is yet very strong behind : And that is, seeing it is granted that some, Faith in Christ is justifying, and some is not justifying; whence comes this about? Is it not because one is a lively and operative Faith, and the other is drie and unactive and unfruitful? So that Faith which is said to Justifie, is it self first Justified by its works. For though, as hath been said, Faith doth absolutely produce good Works, and not good Works Faith : yet good Works are they in which its goodness consists next unto its object, Christ, and consequently render it Justifying actually.

And whereas they would evade his, and elude St. James's authority, by distinguishing the Cause and Sign of our Justification : saying, That we are Justified only by Faith (*effective*) effectually, but by works (as St. James saith *ostensive*) declaratorily, as signs that we are Justified, it is a sense merely obtruded upon the Apostle : there being no more grounds or occasion given by St. James, why they should understand him, that works justifie only *declaratorily*, than are given by St. Paul, that I should interpret that Justification which he ascribes to Faith, to be only *Declaratorily*. For though Faith received in the mind is not apparent, yet when it is professed, then it may be said no less to declare our Justification than good works, as the Scripture it self testifies, saying, *With the heart man believeth unto righteousness* (i. e. to the doing of works of righteousness, which proceed from a true Faith) *and with the mouth confession is made unto Salvation.*

Rom. 10. 10.

## • CHAP. XX.

*Of the Special Notion of Faith; and the Influence it hath on our Justification. Of Faith Solitary, and Onely. Of a Particular and General Faith. Particular Faith no more an Instrument of our Justification by Christ, than other co-ordinate Graces. How some Ancient Fathers affirm that Faith without Works Justifie.*

**A**LL this while we have treated of the complex notion of Faith; or at least, as it is that first general Grace whereby we are inserted into Christ, and justified by it together with its blessed retinue of subordinate Evangelical Graces, which are reduced to these three, *Faith, Hope, and Charity*: where Faith standeth by its self, and is a peculiar Grace of it self, and hath in this acceptation a more then common prerogative attributed unto it in order to our Justification, or the bringing us to Christ, and partaking of Christ. For that is it whereby we are only properly justified; and all Graces serve for no other end here, than to *adapt* us for the benefit of Justification through Christ, and for Christ's sake alone. So that no man can as yet complain, That though I derogate somewhat from the virtue and value of Faith in reference to our Justification, as it is explained by modern Divines (some I mean;) I do not in the least detract from the sufficiencies, freeness, and absolute necessity of Christ's Merits and Grace towards us. Yea, I establish it; nay, I augment and commend more the Free Grace of God, then do they who have chose another way to express it. For all this while I do not compare Works with Christ, nor Hope, nor Charity, nor Obedience, with Christ; (as is plain) but I compare now one Grace with another; and Faith simply considered, with the obedience of Faith. For, Faith taken as in general for the embracing of the whole *Body* of the Gospel, hath this undoubted prerogative to be the Grace of all Graces, the Mother of all, the Fountain from which all flow; and, as the Fathers generally do justifie, because it is the foundation of all access to Christ. Which assertion of theirs, however later Wits have slighted and contemned, as not giving Faith its due, in order to our Justification, doth in my opinion, with much greater perspicuity and simplicity and soundness, express its proper office, then those newly invented; and several distinctions and sub-distinctions confounding, rather than settling the judgment of a good Christian.

And first, They ascribe this virtue of Justifying to a special Faith: Then they say, this Faith doth not justifie as a Work, or Act, but Grace.

*Fides quæ est justitiæ fundamentum, quam nulla bona opera præcedunt, sed ex qua omnia procedunt, ipsa nos à peccatis nostris purgat, &c.* Prosper Lib. 3. de Vita Contemplativa, cap. 21. *Fides est omnium bonorum fundamentum: & humane salutis initium, &c.* August. in Vigilia Pentecostis.

*Fundamentum ergo est justitiæ Fides. Ambr. Offic. Lib. 1. cap. 29. & Lib. 2. cap. 2. Habet vitam æternam fides, quia est fundamentum bonum: Habet & facta, quia vir justus & dilectus & factus probatur. &c.* Id. de Basilicis non Tradendis.

Then they proceed to affirm, That not as a principal cause, but only as an instrument created by God in the heart to that end. And yet farther, Not as an Instrument active and operative; but as an Instrument rather receptive and passive, as appears by the example given of an Hand, which is no true cause of an Alms given; but yet it properly receives it. But first, What a disorder must these multiplied niceties needs breed in the minds of the simpler sort, who are not able to comprehend them; and so are brought into great troubles of conscience, whether their Faith be directed to Christ under the true relation it ought to bear? How much more clear and easie is that Doctrine that teaches, First; That neither our Faith nor Works proceeding from thence, can avail any thing, without Christ, and that all their sufficiency is of Christ. And next, That this Faith and good Works do but qualifie us, according to the Free Covenant of Grace, for Christ. Secondly, If it be denyed, as in truth it is, That Faith is any more an Instrument, whether active or passive; or a Hand, as it is called, to lay hold (especially in another kind) of Christ, than Hope or Charity; I do not find how they can prove it. For I may, and do yield a greater degree of vertue in Faith special, well founded on God, than in other Graces distinct from it; but I do not yield that this is the Faith properly by them contended for; For, It is a mixt compound Grace, consisting of Hope and Love, which they call [*Fiducia*] Confidence, and resting upon God. This indeed is a special Grace as considered in subordination to the general Grace, whereby we assent and submit to the Gospel of Christ: but it is not special, as distinct from other co-ordinate Graces with it.

Calvin. Inst.  
Petrus Mart.  
Lo. Com.  
clasi. 3. cap. 4.  
num. 6.

But what manner of Faith (say they) do we suppose that, which goes sh ill attended alone? First, I suppose there is such a Grace distinct from others, and that which was set up against others to justify, and now croud- ing into it all others, to make it justifying, they affirm what at first they were so much denyed; namely, That justifying Faith is not so much a single, or singular Christian Grace, as a confluence of many Evangelical Graces together; which render a man capable of being justified; according to the Covenant of Free Grace, before God, though never worthy. To which we readily assent. Again, If, as they say, Faith [*Sola, non Solitaria*] Only, not Alone justifies, it will be no less difficult for them to give either good authority or reason, why the same may not be ascribed to Love, or Charity, or to Hope; and when the insufficiency of either of these be declared, to that effect; it may not as reasonably now, as before he replied, and said, Charity only doth justify, but not alone, because Faith and Hope must be conjoynd with it. There is little judgment or singularity in such manner of disputings as these.

Perkins on  
Gal. 3. v. 10. &c

But here, to prevent suspicion of mis-reporting the opinions of such as contend for a modern notion of justification by Faith, which the Holy Fathers were ignorant of, I find my self constrained to set down the state and reason of the Question, as that learned man, Mr. Perkins hath explain'd, and defended Justification by Faith. In his *Reformed Catholique, Point the fourth*: And in his Comment on the *Galatians* he moves this necessary Querie, as most material to the clearing of the Controversie; *What is that very thing that causeth a man to stand righteous before God; and so to be accepted to Life everlasting.* To this in both places he answers, altogether to the same sense and purpose, and with very little alteration of words; saying, *The Obedience, or Righteousness of Christ, and it stands in two things,* his



his Passion in Life and Death, and his Fulfilling the Law joyned therewith: which he calls the Active and Passive Obedience of Christ. In which resolution there is no difference between us; no exception justly to be taken. Now sayes he afterward (pag. 570. Reform. Cath.) *All, both Papists and Protestants, agree that a sinner is justified by Faith: This agreement (saith he) is only in word.* And why so? *The Papist saying, we are justified by Faith, understands a General or Catholick Faith, whereby a man believeth the Articles of Religion to be true.* But we hold, *That the Faith which justifieth is a Particular Faith, whereby we apply to our selves the Promises of Righteousness, and Life everlasting, by Christ.* But if we say, That even the General Faith (not taken for the Object or Articles of Faith, but Habit exercised) performeth this sufficiently, though not immediately (as in truth we do) by the influence it hath upon inferiour and subordinate Graces, whereof a Particular is but one; then in vain is all laid upon the Particular Faith. And that place by him alledged out of Galatians 2.20. makes more against what he would prove by it, than for it: viz. *I live by the Faith of the Son of God.* For it is directly denyed, That hereby is intended such a Particular Faith as is before mentioned by us: The words of the Apostle before, and the main design of his Epistle declaring that he understood no other Faith in Christ here, than that General whereby he relinquished the Law of Moses, with all its imperfect umbrages, and betook himself, by Faith, to Christ; and liv'd now according to Christ, and not to Moses. Neither doth that which follows prove the specialty of this St. Pauls Faith, as he conceives: viz. *Who hath loved me, and given himself for me,* particularly. For this is apparently a Predicate of Christ, and not of the Faith there spoken of: It is a description of Christ, and not of the Faith in Christ; which if it were, would make but little to the purpose. For who knows not that a General Faith comprehends a particular Faith, and the Faith whereby we believe and receive the Gospel, disposes us to believe that Christ dyed for us, which is one part of that Faith: And the Faith that believes that Christ dyed for all, doth necessarily lead us to believe that Christ dyed for me particularly. Therefore, still it remaineth unresolved, what singular and signal vertue there is in the Particular Grace of Faith, which other Evangelical Graces depending upon the General Faith, as well as doth this Particular Faith, may not be capable of in order to our Justification.

Hear we then, to understand this better, what the same learned Author sayes in the entrance to that Treatise of the Reformed Catholick. *A man is justified by Faith alone, because Faith is that alone instrument, created in the heart by the Holy Ghost, whereby the sinner layeth hold on Christ his Righteousness, and applyeth the same unto himself: There is neither Hope, nor Love, nor any other Grace of God within man, that doth this, but Faith alone.* Thus he. Where several things are taken for granted, not to be granted. First, That Faith is any more created in the heart of man, than any other Grace, there expressed or implied. Secondly, That it is an Instrument Active, laying hold of Christ, in a special different manner from other Graces. For in truth, we are not so much justified or made partakers of Christ, by our laying hold of him; as by his laying hold of us. Thirdly, That in what sense Faith may be said to lay hold on Christ, in the same, the other Graces may not likewise be said so to do; because all Graces (speaking properly) which are indeed operative (as is said) towards our Sanctification, are but Passive in order to our Justification, which is an act of

Perkins Re-  
form. Catho-  
lick, pag. 570.

Isaiah 26. 3.

John 15. 3.  
Acts 15. 9.

*Fides nos à  
peccatis omni-  
bus purgat,  
mentes nostras  
illuminat, Deo  
concliat. Pro-  
sper, ubi supr.*

God only, declaring, and holding us Just in Christ Jesus. So that the old Querie here returns upon us again, Which of all these Graces prevail most to the inserting us into Christ: which I grant to be the General Faith, as a foundation and first mover of all Graces. And as for the particular Faith compared with its fellow Graces, it may be allowed a *greater vertue*, but not of *another kind*, in reference to our union with Christ. For, when an humble and desponding Christian considering his own unworthiness, and the unsufficiency of his repentance it self, and graces to incline God to mercy, so far as for their sakes to accept him in Christ for just and innocent; he, as the last refuge he hath, quitteth all worth and capacities in himself, and fleeth with a strong confidence (which in this case is called Faith) unto the free and absolute Grace of God revealed in Christ Jesus unto us: upon which God beholding the whole glory of the Absolution of such a sinner, to redound to his Grace, is pleased to receive such a person to mercy, according to that of the Prophet *Esay*, *Thou shalt keep him in perfect peace whose mind is stayed on thee, because he trusteth in thee.* Than which words I find no testimonies of Scripture, of the many alledged, more pregnantly proving the power of that fiducial Faith (as I may so call it) in order to the Justification of a man before God: and yet it must here be granted, That this trust is much different from the Faith contended for. And that from hence, or the like Texts, not a different vertue in nature or kind, though peradventure more effectual and prevalent, is ascribed to it above other Graces, in order to our Justification. All which is no less true of our Sanctification than our Justification. For we are altogether as much sanctified by Faith alone, as we are justified by Faith alone, or only: as appeareth from the Scripture, which saith, *That our hearts are purified by Faith.* So that in this much disputed Question, I know no readier way of satisfying the fearful and dubious mind, than by taking a due estimate of the power of a General or Particular Faith in reference to our Sanctification, and judging alike of our Justification thereby. For we are sanctified as freely by Grace, as we are justified, and as much by Faith too: as *Prosper* before cited, saith.

And therefore, lastly, in answer to divers places of the Ancients which are produced to confirm the modern sense of Justification by Faith alone, I answer in a word. That it is true, their words seem to attest so much, but their meaning was plainly no more than this; That Faith many times doth justify without Works, that is, any outward manifestation of their Faith, by such fruits: but never without inward acts of Repentance and Charity distinct from this special Faith: nor without such a devotion to good Works, which wants nothing but opportunity to exert them; which is by an extraordinary Clemencie and Grace of God, accepted for the thing it self. This appears by the example by them given, to manifest their meaning, of the Thief on the Cross; who was so justified and saved by Faith alone, without good Works answerable thereunto, because his sudden faith was prevented by sudden death. Nevertheless, That his Faith was so much alone as to exclude Repentance, and such Graces as were competible to one in his condition from a proportionable concurrence to that effect, is no where said, nor intended by any of the Fathers, whose judgment is of account in the Church of God.

## CHAP. XXI.

*A third Effect of Justifying Faith, Assurance of our Salvation. How far a man is bound to be sure of his Salvation; and how far this assurance may be obtained. The Reasons commonly drawn from Scripture proving the necessity of this assurance, not sufficient, &c.*

**A**Nother effect of Faith, or at least consequence upon it, hath the certainty or assurance of our Justification and Salvation been commonly reputed. - The better to understand which, we must take as supposed and granted the difference between the Truth of a thing, and Evidence of it: or the Certainty that such a thing is, and the knowledge that so it is. So that the doubting of our Justification or Salvation, doth not make the thing infallibly so, but leaves us under fears, and sometimes disconsolations: But a competent remedy seems to me to be ready at hand, if we consider that our opinion of our selves is no good conclusion against our selves; but rather, being founded in humility and disowning of our worth and righteousness, an introduction to a comfortable hope in Gods mercy, who hath begun at least the work of Grace in us, by rendring us studious and anxious about his service, and our salvation: unless it could be proved (which we shall see presently whether so or not) out of the word of God, that it is his will and direct command that we should have this assurance in us. For as saint John saith, *Hereby we know that we are of the truth, and shall assure our hearts before him: For if our heart condemn us, God is greater than our heart, and knoweth all things; i. e.* the hearts and consciences of the children of God do frequently condemn them; but their comfort is, that God is greater than their hearts, and doth not judge according to what opinion, good or evil, we have of our selves, but according to his own Wisdom and Grace. So that it is no just inference at all, *I do not believe I shall be saved, therefore I shall not be saved.* Nor this: *I do believe I shall not be saved, therefore I shall not be saved.* Only they have great cause thus to argue and conclude against themselves, who are wont, on the contrary, to reason *I believe I shall be saved, therefore I shall be saved;* abusing and corrupting the Doctrine of Faith two wayes most dangerously. First, In making it the simple and direct cause or means unto Justification; and then a reason of a Reflex act, whereby they stand assured that they are so acquitted, and justified before God. But St. John in the former words cited, reasons much otherwise. For having in the 18. verse exhorted to, and urged the duty of mutual Christian Charity, he inferreth from thence, in the 19. verse, *Hereby we know that we are of the truth, &c. i. e.* from the Indication of Love and Charity to the Brethren.

1 John 3. 19;  
20.

Here is then an assurance, and that before God; and yet, as we have seen,



seen, there resteth and consisteth withall a diffidence and doubting, as we have shewed: The reconciliation of this seeming opposition doth lead us to a necessary distinction tending to the resolving of the principal Que-  
 rie; and it is between the *State* of Justification, and the *Act* of Justifica-  
 tion. And again, as to Assurance here spoken of, It is one thing to be  
 assured of our Justification, and another of our Salvation, as shall here-  
 after appear. First then, I hold it sufficiently demonstrable out of Scrip-  
 ture, That a man may, and every good Christian ought to be assured that  
 he is in a *state* of being justified and saved likewise. This we teach well  
 in our Church Catechise in answer to this Question, *Doeſt not thou think that  
 thou art bound to believe, as they have promised for thee?* thus. *Yes verily;  
 and by Gods help ſo I will: and I heartily thank our heavenly Father,  
 that he hath called me to this State of Salvation, through Jeſus Chriſt our  
 Saviour.* Every Christian that in Baptism hath put on Christ, and is en-  
 tred into a Covenant of Grace with God, is bound to believe assuredly,  
 that thereby he is in a state of Salvation and Justification. For thereby,  
 God hath especially elected him to salvation: of which Election the Scrip-  
 tures chiefly, if not only, speak; which are drawn to signify the Eternal  
 Decree of God, choosing not only men estranged from God to the Cove-  
 nant of Grace, but such as are first within the Covenant, to an infallible  
 Justification and Salvation. This I say is rarely, if at all intended by any  
 of those many Texts of Scripture alledged to prove the same, they  
 meaning no more then Gods Election to the state of Grace; that is, the  
 Faith and Profession of the Gospel. Whence it is that the persons so cal-  
 led and converted to Christ, are by St. Paul called *the Election*: as  
 Rom. 9. 11. *For the children being not yet born, neither having done good  
 or evil, that the purpose of God according to Election might stand, not of  
 works but of him that calleth.* Here the purpose of God is distinguished  
 from the election of God; meaning That, what God had before-time pur-  
 posed and resolved on, he in time executed in electing the younger, and  
 relinquishing the elder, and that rather from his own Free-will, then any  
 difference in the Persons so elected inducing him thereunto. And so  
 Chap. 11. v. 5. *The remnant according to his election, is the remnant ele-  
 cted.* And again, verse 7. he saith, *The election hath obtained.* And verse 28.  
*Touching the election they are beloved.* In which three places, it is some-  
 plain, That by election St. Paul doth mean the Persons elected from Jew-  
 ish Superstition to Christian Profession. As St. Peter also useth the same  
 word, saying of the Jewish Converts, *Elected together with you.* And  
 1 Pet. 1. 2. *Matth. 24. 22, 24, 32.* and several other places, in which  
 nothing more is intended by the Holy Ghost, than they who were in out-  
 ward communion of Faith. So that being sure of a mans Election, as  
 every ordinary Christian is, he becomes in proportionable manner sure of  
 his Justification and Salvation; that is, sure that the Faith he professes is  
 altogether sufficient to lead him infallibly to salvation; which neither the  
 Religion of the Jew or Gentile can assure him of. Yet to the reaping of  
 the fruit hereof, it must alwayes be supposed, That such condition as  
 God requires on the Party stipulating be not wanting.

Now of this sort of Assurance I make no doubt but the word of God is  
 more genuinely interpreted and applyed, than of that personal assurance  
 peculiar to some, who frame another notion of being elected; which is  
 of being signally chosen out of the former Elect to an infallible assurance  
 of their Justification and Salvation: which though I willingly grant to be  
 true;

Rom. 9. 11.

Chap. 11. v. 5.  
7.  
28.

1 Pet. 5. 13.

true; viz. That God hath his peculiar ones amongst Christians too, as Christians amongst Heathen; yet I find little or nothing spoken of under the said Appellations of Elect, Elected, Election, in Scripture, but of the first sense generally. My appeal shall be to the indifferent judge, by laying the testimonies before him, which are principally these, many coming nothing near the point. *St. Paul saith to the Romans of Abraham, That he did not doubt of the promise of God through unbelief; but was strong in faith, giving glory to God. And being fully perswaded that what he had promised, he was able also to perform.* Rom. 4. 20, 21. How far this is beside the matter every sober man will easily see, that shall consider seriously; That these Promises were made directly and expressly to *Abrahams* person, and not in common with other persons. And can any man be so unadvised as to conclude, That because *Abraham* having such a particular and personal Promise made to him by God, and indeed absolute and inconditionate, that he should have a Son by *Sarah* his wife, which he believed, and without staggering was assured of; therefore they, who have no such personal assurances given of God, but only general, and alwayes conditional, of their Justification and Life Everlasting, can be in like manner assured of the same: or ought to believe that they shall be saved, as much as *Abraham* did, that God would send him a Son, as he promised? The sum of Gods infallible Promise to Christians is this in *St. Matthew, He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved:* Matth. 16. 16. where it must of necessity be granted that, *Believing* is a very comprehensive word, according to our distinction of Faith above given; and consequently that it cannot be so evident to a man that he believeth, according to the Tenour and intent of the Covenant of Grace, as it was to *Abraham*, that God himself made such a Promise to him; and therefore hath not the like footing for his Faith, assuring him that he believeth aright, as that he should have a Son, when his common sense told him that God had promised he should.

It is said, that Faith is opposite to doubting: For, *Christ said to Peter, Matth. 14. 31. O thou of little Faith, wherefore didst thou doubt?* This is very true: and therefore we say, It is no article or object of our Faith, to believe that we shall be infallibly saved: but it is rather an object of our Fear, and more properly of our Hope. For though it be said in the Apostles Creed, *I believe the remission or forgiveness of sins;* it is not meant, that any man should thereby stand obliged to believe, as an Article of Faith, the actual forgiveness of his own sins: but that his own sins and all other Christian peoples are remissible: and that in the *Catholick Church*, there is forgiveness to all that repent and believe. And this is no more then that General Assurance; that by being baptized we are in a state of Salvation, as is above-said.

To multiply many Texts to infer this from Gods faithfulness, who promisseth: and from his gifts being without repentance, and such like, are not worth their time that use them; nor would it be worth time to examine them, any farther then to say, That they are a great deal too large, to have any particular relation to a mans personal state: As if God must needs change, if a man falls from his stedfast purpose: Or God, when he in his own counsel determines to save any man infallibly, must inseparably annex thereunto this Evidence of his will to the Party, any more then it is necessary that all men, who leave others their Estates, should tell them so much; and require at their hands that they make no question of the same, under the penalty of forfeiting all.

The

John 1. 12.

Neither dowe  
promise any  
other securi-  
ty of Salvati-  
on by only  
Faith, but to  
those that la-  
bour in their  
calling, and  
be fruitful of  
good Works.  
Dr. Fulk on  
Rhem. Test.  
Phil. 3. v. 11.  
\* Rom. 8. 15,  
16.  
See likewise  
1 John 5. 9, 10

The surest grounds therefore for this seem to be taken from revelation; which no Christian can absolutely oppose: For not only may God, but God hath revealed this to others, by the testimony of his Spirit, or other sufficient Evidence for to beget an assurance. But two exceptions are made against this way; the one, That the dispute is only about the Ordinary dispensations, common to all true believers. The other, That these places alledged prove no more than the common Justification of believers, and their Adoption: As for instance, *John 1. 12. As many as received him, to them gave he power to become the Sons of God: even as many as believe in his name.* Here, say they, believing is put for receiving; so that true faith receiveth Christ: and this it doth by a particular application of general promises unto a mans self: Therefore a man ought to be particularly assured of his being in Christ. The whole Antecedent I grant; viz. That every man believeth Christ when he receiveth him; and that Christ is received by Faith: And that every man is bound to apply Christ particularly, and his Promises to himself. But the consequence here made, follows not from hence: For by the former, a man believes assuredly that the Promises of Grace made through Christ to the Church, do particularly belong to him: he hath a right to them, being called to the Covenant: And thus far a man is, and ought to be sure of his Salvation. But there being implied in all Promises of Everlasting Salvation, certain conditions of obeying and repenting, as well as believing simply, whether a man is to that degree proficient in these, as to put him in actual possession of Christ; this is no where revealed, neither are we commanded to believe it.

And when St. Paul saith to the Romans; \* *Ye have not received again the spirit of bondage to fear, but ye have received the spirit of adoption, whereby we cry, Abba, Father.* What is more plain than that his meaning is, to distinguish the general state of the Church of the Jews from the Church of the Gentiles: and the spirit of Moses (as I may so say) which tender'd to bondage, from the spirit of Christ, which is that free Spirit: For as it is elsewhere said, *If the Son make you free, then shall you be free indeed.* And from hence no more can be concluded to any single person than to the whole Church of God, in which there are many reprobates, as all agree. Neither is the matter helped out any whit by what follows; *The Spirit it self beareth witness with our Spirit, that we are the Sons of God.* I presume, few will be so severe and ignorant as to deny the large acceptance in Scripture of the *Children of God*, and *Sons of God*, and *Saints*, viz. That generally they signifie no more than those who were elected outwardly to the Faith and Profession of Christ, and to the means of becoming, not only denominatively, and of *Right*, but really, and effectually in *Fact*, the heirs of Eternal Salvation. To be then *the Sons of God*, here with St. Paul, signifies no more than by Faith to be the *peculiar people* and favorites of God, above all such as were not thus brought home to Christs Fold. Now that such singular Grace and Priviledges belonged to Christian, St. Paul proves from the testimony of the Spirit, namely; That the Christian Religion is only the true Religion, thus. *The Spirit beareth witness with our Spirit:* Our own Judgment, our Consciences doth steadfastly assure us that we are the Children of God: but this is not all: this proves nothing to another to the convincing of him that we are the true Servants and Children of God; but *the Spirit of God bearing witness with our Spirit*, doth. And the Spirit of God beareth witness with us sufficiently,



ently, when it declareth openly by miracles, signs, and wonders wrought before the eyes of our Adversaries, that what we preach and believe is the truth: Which is the same with what St. Paul writes to the *Corinthians*, saying: *And my speech and my preaching was not with enticing words of mans wisdom, but in demonstration of the Spirit, and of Power: That your faith might stand not in the wisdom of man, but in the power of God.* In which words he plainly sheweth the ground of the *Corinthians* faith, not to be taken from any fair or plausible Rhetorick, or form of words, whereby men are led oftentimes to believe against reason; but on the more solid grounds of extraordinary miracles, wrought by the power of God, and which did demonstrate to all equal judges, That it was the Spirit of God which both taught them such mysteries of Faith as they preached, and confirmed the same by such signs and wonders, as did appear generally at the publication of the Gospel. Now what doth all or any of this concern the supposed particular, inward, tacit testimony, whereby it is said a man is to be assured of his Salvation: And no more do the words of the Apostle in the end of the same Chapter prove, too long to be recited: but this is briefly to be answered. 1. That they speak not at all of any individual, single Christian, but of the Church of God, and that indefinitely or at large: viz. That God hath so determined to plant, propagate, and maintain that Religion, into which divers were collected by the ministry of the Apostles, that whatever, or from whomsoever, evils might befall the Church of God, yet they should never prevail with such persecutions to separate the faithful from Christ: no not all the Powers nor Principalities on Earth, nor all the Angels of Heaven, or of Hell.

1 Cor. 2. 4.

Rom. 8. 35, 36  
37, 38, 39.

But to secure these and the like testimonies the better, to their opinions, some much admired persons of the Reformation (peradventure suspecting what might be answered) have proceeded to say, *That what promises Christ hath made to his Church, do equally concern every Christian as well as the Church:* which I cannot yield to, without these Exceptions: First, That it may be understood of a particular Church, as well as particular Persons. But (as may hereafter appear) God hath made no absolute promise to any particular Church so far, that it can be any point of Faith to believe that Gods counsel & decree are such to it, as never to suffer it to Apostatize from him: So that no individual Church can be sure of its perseverance in the truth: and if not that, how should any particular person claim so much? But the Promises of Christ being taken (as they ought) of a Church indefinitely, it is most agreeable to Gods word to maintain an infallible perpetuity of the same. Again; It is to be remembered, that all this while, we are speaking, not so much of certainty before God (according to which we may yield the Salvation of men to be infallible) but certainty before men; or to the party concerned immediately, which we call *Assurance* or *Evidence*. In the body of an Orthodox Church, it is certain in it self, that many men shall be saved, but not certain to us that any one therein shall; nor evident to any one, that he shall.

Calvin. Inst.

To the reasons taken from the Power of God, who is able to save, and reveal this; And the truth of God, who is faithful in his Promise; And the Knowledge of God, that he knoweth who are his; what need we make any answer, besides showing the vanity of that inference which is drawn from the possibility of any thing, to the Fact it self? and of that presumption, rather than faith, which leadeth men to assure themselves of the

benefit of the promises, which are conditional, before it be evident unto them that such conditions have been duly observed by them. The consideration of this uneven dealing and unreasonable conclusion, upon such a supposal, hath prevailed with some to make the promises of Salvation so free, as not to consist with any condition, but peremptory, and absolute, yea, excluding Faith it self (the last thing of all that their Religion will suffer them to deny God) as a Condition; making the only use of it to be, to receive what is so freely given them, as they falsely and prophane-ly imagine.

It will not, after this, be necessary to lay down the reasons of the contrary opinion, having already shewed, That there is no Precept for such a point of Faith, no Proposition declaring it, no Article of our Creed requiring it, that falling very short of it which teacheth us to believe in God: wherein they say three things are imposed on us to believe. First, That there is a God. Secondly, That this God is my God. Thirdly, That I must trust and put my confidence in him for my salvation: All which we readily assent unto. But the most pertinent of all these come not home to the case before us. For every man may, and ought to put his confidence in God for his Salvation: and yet be never so much as confident of his Salvation, as is plain: and that upon this reason, That the wellgrounding of such a confidence as this latter, may be very obscure to him, and so the thing it self not clear. Again, It is prescribed by the Lords Prayer, and other places of Scripture, to pray daily for Remission of Sins, saying, *Forgive us our sins, as we forgive them that trespass against us*: this we are no less to pray for than for our daily bread. Therefore since we are not ordinarily so assured of the Pardon of them: For as a man hopeth not properly for what he hath, neither doth he pray for it, knowing he hath it. This St. Pauls argument to the *Hebrews* proves, saying; *Where remission of sin is, there is no more offerings for sin*: i. e. where the remission of our sins is known to us. Praying being our Sacrifice under the Gospel. This were ridiculous, and displeasing to God, we thereby implying that we have not that which we know we have; which were unthankfully done of us. God in such cases expecting justly from us, acknowledgment of his Grace, conferring such a blessing by all humble and devout Praise and Thanksgiving for it, and not absurdly petitioning him as if we had it not. And this is so convincing upon some, that I find a bold profession in these words, *The fourth Petition* [in the Lords Prayer] *must be understood not so much of our old sins or debts, as of our present and new sins*. I grant we must petition for pardon for our new sins: but I deny that we are not daily to repent and beg mercy at Gods hands all the dayes of our Life, for our ancient, as well as modern offences. And therefore the same Author suspecting (it may be) the insufficiencie of this answer, proceedeth; I answer again: *We pray for the pardon of our sins, not because we have no assurance thereof, because our assurance is small: we grow on from grace to grace in Christ, &c.* Which is very soundly and soberly spoken, but quite overthrows what was before contended for about Certainty. For Assurance that is weak and small, is no assurance; but a competent degree, and a comfortable measure of hope and probability: which we not only allow, but know to be enjoined us in holy Scripture by St. Peter, saying; *Make your calling and election sure, for if ye do these things ye shall never fall*. Where we grant, That a man is bound so to walk, believe, and live, as becometh the Faith

he

Hanno. M.

Perkins.

2 Pet. I. 10.

he professes, that his Salvation is sure before God, and that he shall in that conjuncture, never fall; but this is not made so sure thereby to himself; and one reason is included in the very words, which are, *If ye do these things*: which implies that such things may be omitted, and expresses the consequence thereupon.

And not only doth this premature Certitude take us off from Prayer and Repentance, which alone destroy all true Faith in us, and under a glorious shew of most supream and firm assurance, leave us really destitute of the proper means to attain that good degree of perswasion to the quieting of the troubled and distrustful Conscience, but it also quite alienates the mind, and enfeebles the hands of faithful men, in the vigorous pursuit of obedience; without which no man shall be saved. For, as a man cannot, needs not, repent of what he knows to be so fully forgiven, nor ask that pardon again, which he is thoroughly perswaded is granted him: So neither can any man with that solicitude and resolution pursue the means of Salvation principally seen in obeying Gods Laws with Faith in Christs merits, when his mind shall be wholly possessed with an opinion, that the principal end next to the glory of God, is absolutely satisfied, namely his soul saved.

They say indeed that the meditation hereof should rather quicken, and incite men to a more exact walking with God, out of a greater obligation of gratitude, and common ingenuity, to make returns answerable to the singular Grace conferred. 'Tis true, it should so, indeed. And so should an inheritance put actually and irrevocably into the son and heirs hands, before the death of the Father. But how many instances have we, That so it is not; for one, That so it is? Or who can say, That ingenuity and good natur'dness are generally as powerful to keep up order and vertue in the world, as the proposing of future favours, and penalties to the persons concerned? We are not therefore to judge of the future motions of men so much from some moral obligations, as from natural propensions. And who can say, That naturally we are as prone to do good to others, as to our selves? To obey God abstractively, i. e. secluding the fears and hopes we have from that service, is to do it for Gods sake, which is confessed to be the most noble principle a man can act by; but when the Evils imminent on disobedience, or the Blessing ensuing our obedience, thorowly affect us, we then will move upon a natural principle actuated and promoted by Faith.

But to conclude this, the Sum of what a good Christian is to believe in this point, is

First, The immutableness of God in his covenanting with man, and the mutableness of man on his part, in fulfilling the terms he is tied to God in. Both these are intimated to us in these words of Sr. Paul, which are vulgarly brought against us; viz. *Nevertheless, the foundation of God standeth sure, having this seal, The Lord knoweth who are his. And, let every one that nameth the name of Christ depart from iniquity.* The first foundation of God, is that which he hath layed in his assuring us, that he will have a Church in despite of all Enemies and Persecuters, which would destroy it. The second is the seal to this Charter; which relating to special persons, is twofold: The First, That *God knoweth who are his*; that is, (according to Scripture phrase) owneth and asserteth the cause of those that are his, and will never forsake them, otherwise than he hath declared; that is, they not violating egregiously the Covenant on their

*Quod non me-  
tuitur contem-  
nitur, quod  
contemnitur  
utique non col-  
tur. Ita fit ut  
religio & ma-  
jestas & honor,  
metu constet,  
metus autem  
non est ubi nul-  
lus irascitur.  
Lactant. De  
Ira Dei, cap. 8*

2 Tim. 2. 19.



parts. The second is that which follows; viz. *Let every one that nameth the name of Christ depart from iniquity.* This is the seal set to the Covenant made by God; which if not duly and proportionably, to the favourableness of the Evangelical Covenant, observed by man, the seal of God avails but little to the benefit of a Christian.

A second conclusion may be, That notwithstanding God hath no where enjoined us, under any forfeiture, to obtain this assurance; yet he requireth us to be alwayes so pressing and proficient in Faith and Holiness of Life, that, above his Capitulations or ordinary Promises made in his Word, he may communicate his pleasure unto us, and good-will concerning the particular salvation of us. This hath been imparted unto divers, and may again, when it seems good to God: But it is no Rule to us.

Thirdly, A faithful Christian ought to endeavour the attaining to a strong and true degree of Hope, by Gods grace, and the working out of his Salvation with fear and trembling. For St. John saith, That a man may arrive to such a state of assurance (as 'tis called) that, considering and believing the undetermined mercy of God in the Gospel, he may have confidence of Gods love towards him, his own conscience not condemning him: as St. John saith, *Beloved, if our heart condemn us not, then have we confidence towards God.*

1 John 3. 21.

Lastly, This sense serves much to the comfort and tranquility of the mind of scrupulous Christians, more than the holding of a peremptory assurance of Salvation: which they, who require it, cannot deny to be wanting to many faithful servants of God. For, when they consider that the want of this assurance is no indication or character of a Reprobate, as some would make it (and they must, who bring it under precept and promise) then are they heartened still to press towards holy and devout exercises, believing that God, not seeing nor judging as man judgeth, nor as they of themselves, but out of his incircumscribed mercie, may accept them, and have mercy on them. And here properly doth that doctrine of Faith, commended in the Articles of our Church, as very comfortable, take place; viz. as that which, when we have done all, we must betake our selves unto, and which brings us neere to God: namely, not that we believe we are justified for, or because we believe we are, freely; but because Faith, and trust in God, as it is the first stone in our heavenly building, so is it the crown and consummation of all, when we disown and disavow all sufficiency in our selves, or our most Christian Acts, even Faith it self; and trust in his mercy to be accepted, under all our fears and reasonings to the contrary; not manifestly violating the Covenant with God, for which our own hearts and ordinary apprehensions may condemn us.

## CHAP. XXII.

*Of the Contrary to true Faith, Apostasie, Heresie, and Atheism. Their differences. The Difficulty of judging aright of Heresie. Two things constituting Heresie. The Evil disposition of the mind, and the falseness of the Matter. How far and when Heresie destroyes Faith. How far it destroyes the Nature of a Church.*

**T**HUS having sufficiently treated of the most general and principal Effect of Faith; before we leave this, we are in reason to enquire into that which privatively relates to true Faith, and that is, Heresie; What that is? and wherein it consisteth? For Heresie cannot properly be applied to any but such who are of the Faith; and in some degree belong to the Catholick Church: wherein it is distinct from Atheism, Apostasie, and professed Infidelity. For Infidelity, though it carries with it in its name, a sense which comprehends both Atheism and Apostasie, yet use hath prevailed so far as to apply it only to such who do receive some Articles of the Christian Faith, and them fundamental too, though not as the Christians. For Example: Infidels may believe there is a God, and that God but one, and that there shall be a Resurrection of the Just and Unjust, and Life everlasting, either in misery or blis: yet being either wholly ignorant of, or directly denying some fundamental Points of Faith, as Christian, they continue Infidels, though not Atheists. Neither can they be accounted Hereticks, having never been of the Church, nor initiated into, or embraced the true Faith. These are Negatively only related to the Church, as Logicians say, Dissimilary things relate one to another, *viz.* A black thing to a white: But Heresie is of a privative sense, and an opposition to the true Catholick Faith, with an Obligation not only taken from the matter of Faith it self, to which all the world owe homage and obedience, but from some extrinsecal formalities whereby some men more especially contract a relation to the Church of Christ. And the first and most principal cause hereof is, the solemn dedication which is made by our selves, or others (we not oppugning it) of us in the initiating Rite of Baptism: wherein renunciation is openly made of all things, persons, and opinions, contrary and inconsistent with that Doctrine we there submit unto, and vow to observe. This Dedication of us to Christ, doth make and denominate us Christians; and Catholicks, according to the less ancient use of the word, of which we shall hereafter speak.

Now, according to the degree or manner of violating this most solemn and sacred Vow in Baptism, are men said to be Apostates and Hereticks.

And

And all Apostates are Hereticks, but not all Hereticks, Apostates. The principal difference consisteth in this: 1. That the Apostate doth renounce even the first principles of Christian Faith, as Christian: And they are they which are expressely contained in the form of Baptism, whereby he became a Christian. 2. In a formal profession contrary to such Covenant made with God in Christ. But Heresie doth not absolutely deny the Grounds of Christianity it self, but, whether by affected error, or invincible; doth resolutely and firmly assert things contrary to true Doctrine.

But to give a precise definition of Heresie, as St. *Augustine* of old, so we find at this day, very difficult, and not to turn to the right hand or to the left; not to make it too broad and wide, nor too narrow and rigorous. The Reason hereof may be first taken from the name, which imports such a singularity of choice and addition to an opinion, which may as well be true as false; good, as evil: Thus the ancient Heathens, as well *Roman*, as *Grecian*, used the word; and so did the Christians too for some hundred years after Christ. And when it began to be restrain'd to the evil part, a second thing made the notion of it no less difficult and obscure; viz. the largeness of it, for those errors, which were not material; or of any great consequence to the Christian Faith or Church, as for to stigmatize them which were of note and moment in the same. And a third thing obscuring the true nature, is the manner of asserting and maintaining great, as well as small Errors.

*Heresis dicitur  
Græcæ voce ex  
interpretatione  
ἐκδιονίς, quæ  
quis sine ad in-  
stituendas sus-  
cipiendas uti-  
tur, Sc. Ter-  
tullianus Præ-  
script. cap. 6.  
Vide Ithor.  
Hispanens. O-  
rigin. lib. 73.*

The word

*Heresie* generally signifies any opinion either good or bad. More especially it signifies an Error in Religion. Thus Ecclesiastical Writers take it. — Yet most properly it is an Error in the Foundation of Christian Religion taught and defended with obstinacy. *Perkins on Galat. 5. v. 26.*

To understand this; we must know how that a twofold Criminalness in Heresie, according to the two more essential parts constituting it, according to opinions generally received. The one is called the formal part, which relates to the manner of holding such opinions as are erroneous. For lighter errors against the Doctrine of the Scriptures, and peace of the Church, being maintained with obstinacy, and against due proposal of the truth, do characterize and constitute an Heretick. The other is the material part; namely, That about which men do err in Faith. And this hath a peculiar difficulty in it, arising from the undetermined points of Faith, and, I think a moral impossibility (as they call it) to define what are those so necessary points of Faith, to be believed; the denial whereof makes an Heretick. This is thought generally to be sufficiently explained in the Creeds of the Church, by some. But others find many considerable points not therein comprehended, unless by such a reduction whereby any thing, almost, may be compelled to come under anothers wing. There are therefore that hold that the decrees and resolutions of Councils fully and only can satisfy this scrupulousness; and no question but all these conduce very much to the acquiring a settled Judgment, in matters of Faith; and especially this latter: against which notwithstanding, there may be made these following exceptions. First, That all things defined by Councils, and that with the affixing of Anathema's, are confessedly not of Faith, but of Rites, and Order also. Secondly, That those Canons which are of Faith are so variously and miserably handled, and distracted by Learned Interpreters, that a sober well-meaning Christian may, without any heretical pravity of mind, fall involuntarily

*Inter Hæreticos non sunt deputandi qui aut ab Ecclesiasticis seducti sunt à parentibus: in errorem lapsi nullâ pertinaci animositate defendunt, quæruunt autem cautâ sollicitudine veritatem, corrigi parati, quum invenerint. Augustin. Epist. 168.*



rily into a reputed Heresie. Thirdly, That contrary things have sometimes been determined in several ages. From all which it is manifest, That it is much more easie to define Heresie then an Heretick: because there is an ingredient of personal aversion from, or opposition to the Truth, which can scarce be discovered: but in the abstract, Heresie may properly enough be defined, to be (not an opinion) but a *False Proposition contrary to the Catholick Faith.*

And if it be thus uncertain and obscure what Heresie is, through so many various kinds and degrees thereof, answerable to the several branches; therefore, it cannot be easie to prove, all Heresie in the common notion, as opposite to Faith, to be destructive to Faith. That it destroyes that Part of Faith against which it is bent, is undeniable: but that any particular Error should destroy the whole, any farther than it is opposite to the whole Body of Faith, is incredible. Some Heresies pluck up the Tree of Life, Faith, by the roots; some cut it down to the root; some lop off the arms; some, lesser branches; and some, which have been reputed Heresies, do only brush and beat off the leaves and ornaments. An example of the former is given by St. Paul to the *Corinthians*; some of whom, it should seem, denied the Resurrection in general, and by necessary implication of Christ, who was as dead as any mortal man else. *But if there be no resurrection of the dead, then is Christ not risen: And if Christ be not risen, then is our preaching vain, and your faith is also vain.* It were to no purpose to believe any point in Christian Religion, disbelieving that of the resurrection. And in short, to deny any thing expressed, or necessarily, and immediately included in the form of words used in Baptism, is to root up all our Creed, and render all our Faith vain in other Articles. An instance of the second sort of Heresie, may be, to deny the Mediation of Christ by way of satisfaction for us, restraining the intercession of him to that supposed one, now in Heaven: Of the third, may be Errors about Free-will, and affirming a positive necessity to commit sin against God: Of the denial of the efficacy of Good works done in Christ, towards our salvation: and the affirming a meritoriousness in them towards the same: Of the last, the affirming it unlawful to use any Ceremonies in Gods service, but what are specially commanded in his word.

And from hence it seemeth necessary to distinguish Heresies and Hereticks, into Formal or direct, and Virtual and real. A Formal Heresie is that which is expressly maintained and asserted in terms, but denied in the inference and consequence, which yet certainly and necessarily follows upon such positions: as supposing a man should, with the Monothelites of old, affirm that Christ had but one Will. This is a formal and direct Heresie, but if (as it is possible) the same person should deny the true consequence hereof; viz. That he consisted but of one Nature; He were not a formal Heretick in this latter; because, though this Error doth certainly arise from the former, yet all Heresies being erroneous apprehensions, and affections of the mind, this Error being not received into his mind, doth not so affect him as to denominate him *formally* an Heretick: Yet must he answer for Heresie, in his account before God, because the movers and promoters of such shall no more escape, then he shall from the punishment of drunkenness, who putteth the bottle to his neighbours mouth, provoking him to drink to excess: or of Theft, who will by no means steal himself, but is aiding in his advice, and putting advantages into his hands to take anothers Goods. In like manner, the necessary consequence of a light

Error

1 Cor. 15. 13  
14

Propositio sapiens heresim est ex cuius concessione, co-assumpto aliquo quod non potest rationabiliter negari, sequitur heresis in fide: Ut si quis diceret quod beatus Gregorius non fuisset Papa. Gerlon de necessitate Salutis.

Error being very notorious, though a person be not formally an Heretick in the conclusion, which he may protest against, as not following from his erroneous proposition, yet if in truth it doth so, and is generally so reputed, to the mis-leading of Christians, such a man is really or virtually an Heretick, and obnoxious to the guilt and punishment due unto such Errors which he denies. For instance; It is a notorious Heresie to hold it unnecessary there should be any Church of Christ, and to affirm, That it suffices that every good Christian hath the word of God, and believes, and lives by himself, (though the word of God contradicts this impiety sufficiently) and to be a Christian at large. If any person heretically inclined, shall deny that this is his opinion, or that thus he would have it; yet if he preaches such Doctrine, and publishes such Opinions, which do necessarily infer thus much, he is a notorious Heretick in reality, though not in the formality; As also, if he should teach, The Church hath no power to enjoin any thing besides what the word of God requires. This Error taken simply and nakedly, hath no such monstrousness as may not pass for tolerable, but in the necessary consequence, it is as pernicious to the community of Christians, as to preach against Christ himself. And therefore the argument of late Rationalists is very false founded upon this ground, *viz.* That Christians are not to be obliged under pain of damnation, such as Anathema's and Excommunications are, to any thing which Christ hath not by his Law prescribed: For this indeed taken strictly, is true, Christ (for ought may appear) doth not in Scripture command Rites in use with the Church; but Christ, under pain of his displeasure, doth require that we should do all things not contrary to his injunctions, for the keeping up of the nature of a Church and Christian Society; and therefore, though the Error be in it self light, it falls in the event, heavy upon Christianity it self, and deserves no less rigour than is used towards the offender in Faith it self.

Socinus, Chi.

*Non sunt per-  
na existiman-  
da sine quibus  
magna confi-  
stere enim pos-  
sint. Hieron.*

Lastly, From hence we may reasonably judge of the frequent denunciations of alienation from the Faith and Church, against them who erred heretically: affirming in general, That Heresie quite alienated from the Church, and that Society could not be of the Church which maintained an Heresie. For first, we are to note that few or none before St. Cyprian's time, were so severely censured by the ancient Fathers, but such as were offenders against the very principles of Christianity it self. St. Cyprian indeed, and others from him extended this censure to such as were less criminal: For it is a very hard matter to instance in any one Article of Faith (though I know some great Clerks have attempted it) which Novations or Donatists rejected, or offended against. So that (abating somewhat for the vehemence of the zeal conceived against such enemies to the Church, in the writings of Fathers against Hereticks) it will appear, that it was matter of Fact, rather than Faith, or Heresie which exposed them to such censures. For uncharitableness will as certainly damn, as unfaithfulness: And he that dies for Christ (as divers Hereticks did) in animosity, groundless against his brother, and especially against the Church (of which he is, or ought to be a member) may notwithstanding, loose his Life hereafter, as well as here. But of this more, now we are to speak of the Church.

## CHAP. XXIII.

*Of the proper Subject of Faith, the Church. The distinction and description of the Church. In what sense the Church is a Collection of Saints. Communion Visible as well as Invisible, necessary to the constituting a Church.*

**H**AVING spoken of the Nature, Kinds, Acts, and Effects of Christian Faith, we proceed now to speak of the proper Subject of Faith, which is the Church: Which word is commonly used as well for the Place where our Lord is publicly and solemnly worshipped, as for the People of God serving and worshipping him. But of this latter only we art to treat at present: which we define to be, *A Calling and Collection of Saints from their vain Conversation in the world, to the Faith and Worship of God according to the Rule and Laws of his Holy word; and to visible communion with themselves*: which description I doubt not to be grounded in all its parts upon the Scriptures themselves. And that God is the Author and only Institutor of such a Church, if it needed any proof, the Scripture would soon afford it: St. Paul saith to the *Corinthians*, Chap. 7. \* *But as God hath distributed to every man, as the Lord hath called every one, so let him walk, and so ordain I in all Churches.* And so exhorteth the *Thessalonians* to † *walk worthy of God, who called them to his Kingdom and Glory.* And so in very many places elsewhere, as will appear farther now we consider the Term from whence God doth call and choose his faithful people, and that is the World; the world not taken in its natural sense, signifying the Natural bodies of all sorts; of which it consisteth: nor absolutely from it in the more special sense; in which Mankind is sometimes called the world; for civil conversation and humane, mutual Offices may be maintained, and ought between Christians and Heathens or Infidels: but rather in a moral sense, that is, unnatural, unjust, unrighteous communication with the wicked of the world, as wicked: as St. Paul explaineth himself to the *Corinthians*: *I wrote unto you in an Epistle not to company with fornicatours. Yet not altogether [to refuse to converse] with the fornicatours of this world, or with the covetous or extortioners, or with idolaters: for then must ye needs go out of the world — but if any man that is called a brother be a fornicatour, &c.* St. Peter takes most of the terms in our description, speaking of Convertsto the Faith. *Ye are a chosen generation, a Royal Priesthood, an holy Nation, a peculiar People, that ye should shew forth the praises of God, who hath called you out of darkness into his marvellous light, &c.* And St. Paul to the *Ephesians*. *According as he hath chosen us in him, before the foundation of the World, that we should be holy and without blame before him in love.*

The Church is an universal Congregation or fellowship of Gods faithful People and Elect, built upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ being the head and corner stone. Hom. Chur. of Engl. Part. 2. pa. 213.  
\* 1 Cor. 7. 17.  
† 1 Thess. 2. 12

1 Cor. 5. 9, 10.

1 Pet. 2. 9, 10.

Ephes. 1. 4.

And it hath been shewed before, how that, when in the New Testament.



Matth. 24.31.

we read of Gods Calling, and choosing and electing, we are not so much to understand the eternal purpose or decree of God, but the execution thereof in Gods actual calling and electing certain persons to the profession and belief of the Faith of Christ: which he effected by the fulfilling of the Prophecie made by Christ in St. *Matthews* Gospel, relating to the destruction of the Jewish Polity and Church; and erecting of the Christian instead thereof: *viz. And he shall send his Angels* [that is his Messengers and Ministers] *with a great sound of a trumpet*, (i. e. the Gospel preached and published) *and they shall gather together his elect* (i. e. such as he shall make choice of) *from the four winds*, (i. e. from all quarters of the world) *from one end of heaven to the other*.

Psalm 50. 5.

Rom. 1. 7.

1 Cor. 1. 2.

Now these persons, by Gods word and good-will called from such vanities, ignorances, and vices, are in the Scripture called *Saints*; not so much because they were all so thoroughly, or absolutely sanctified from their former, natural, or moral impieties contracted in their state of Nature and Gentilism, as that they should retain no sin; and none of them should fall of heaven hereafter. But first, either from the better part, the whole was denominated actually holy; which is not unusual in all speech: Or because, having made renunciation of the World and Flesh and Devil in Baptism, they were called and consecrated to Holiness: Or lastly, because they made open and solemn profession thereof, however some so called, might be, and did appear to be reprobates: And names and appellations are given not from any inward affection or quality, which sense cannot judge of, but from such things as are visible and apparent. And thus in the Old Testament, as well as New, it is used. As in the *Psalms*, *Gather my Saints together unto me: those that have made a Covenant with me by Sacrifice*: which imply the whole body of the people of Israel, as the words going immediately before, do also declare. And wherever in the Book of *Psalms* (which is in divers places) we find the Congregation of the Saints, is meant the Israelites in general. And in *Daniel*, Chap. 7. v. 8. 21, 22, 25, 27. is the word necessary taken. Now it being most customary with the Penmen of the New Testament, to borrow the phrase of the Old, this term *Saints* was translated from the Jewish Synagogue to the Christian Church, by St. Paul, expressly to the *Romans*, saying: *To all that be in Rome beloved of God called Saints*; so the original better then the insertion of *to be*, made in the translation. As likewise in his first Epistle to the *Corinthians*; *To the Church of God, which is at Corinth, to them that are sanctified in Christ Jesus; called [to be] Saints withall that in every place call upon the name Jesus Christ, their Lord and ours*. And the like salutation we shall find in most of St. *Pauls* Epistles, as also most frequently in the body of them: as may be obvious to any reader: though I deny not but sometimes in the New Testament it is taken in a more restrained sense, signifying especially the victorious and triumphant, not Militant Saints. From all which it doth sufficiently appear in what sense the Church may, and ought to be described a Society, or Collection of Saints: And withal, how miserably and mischievously they err, who giving that title to a Party, hold themselves bound to gather a certain select number out of Christians not accusable of any notorious error from the Faith of Christ, (as the Apostles of Christ did out of Heathens and Jews) and to constitute and call them *Saints*.

Another thing requisite to the constitution of a Church is, That it be a *Communion of Saints*, it sufficing not, that persons elected or selected (as above-said) be many in number, but holy by nature or institution; as God ordain-

ordained of old in the forming of the Jewish Church, *Deut. 7. 6. Thou art an holy people unto the Lord thy God: The Lord thy God hath chosen thee to be a special people unto himself, above all the people that are upon the face of Earth.* Which words are with advantage applied unto the Christian Church, by *St. Peter*. Whence it is that the same *St. Peter* maketh it an end of calling this company together, *That they may be partakers of the Divine Nature*; or, as it is otherwise more plainly render'd, *Of a Divine Nature*: Holiness drawing us near unto the Nature of God himself. As the Wiseman also writeth: *The giving heed unto her Laws is the assurance of Incorruption, and Incorruption maketh us near unto God.* And not only must they be holy, but to that end, must of necessity hold a twofold communion. The one Invisible with one Head, *Christ*. The other Visible and external, with one another. For the Apostle tells us, speaking of Christians, *The head of every man is Christ.* And to the *Ephesians*; *The husband is the head of the wife, even as Christ is the head of the Church: and he is the Saviour of the world.* There can therefore no question be made, but it is most essential as well to the Church in general, as every particular Christian or Member of the same, that *Christ* be the Head of his Church: as *St. Paul* yet more clearly expresseth it to the *Colossians*, excepting against such Professors of Christian Religion as held not the Head, from which all the Body by joynts and bands having nourishment ministered and knit together, increaseth with the increase of God. Therefore leaving that, as on all hands granted, we come to the external communion of the Church.

*Deut. 7. 6. 26,  
19. 18, 9.*

*1 Pet. 2. 9, 10.  
2 Pet. 1. 4.*

*Wisdom 6.  
18, 19.*

*1 Cor. 11:3.  
Ephes. 5. 23.*

*2 Col. 2. 19.*

## CHAP. XXIV.

*A Preparation to the knowledge of Ecclesiastical Society or of the Church from the consideration of humane Societies. What is Society. What Order. What Government. Of the Original of Government: Reasons against the Peoples being the Original of Power: and their Right to frame Governments. Power not Revocable by the People.*

**I**N the outward Communion of the Church two things are to be enquired into: First, the Nature of it, wherein it consisteth. Secondly, the Adjuncts or Affections thereof. First, we shall treat briefly of the Nature of this Communion. To understand which clearly, it will be expedient to begin with the definition of Communion in General, or Society humane: For Communion is nothing else but Humane Society. And Humane Society is nothing else but a conversation of men out of natural reason inclining and moving them thereunto, for the mutual supply of the particular defects and exigencies each man is

*Civitas à conversatione multorum dicta est, pro eo quod plurimorum in unum constitutur et continetur. Origin. Homil. 5. in Genesim.*

subject unto in a separate condition: And this Society thus combining or concurring together is commonly called a Republick: the word signifying, The common good: it being the design and end of all Republicks or Common-wealths for men, first in order to seek the common interest and good of the whole Society, and so through that to derive particular and private benefit to each member thereof, and not, as some blindly and brutishly addicted to their private personal profits, to begin at home; and not to secure the Publick stock. These are no better than such Pilferers and Thieves, who being in partnership with others, pocket up in the first place all that they can lay hold on, and contribute no more to the common stock than they are by force constrained unto.

*Ordo est p.ri-  
um de dispa-  
ri-um rerum sua  
cuique loco tri-  
buens dispo-  
sio. Aug. Civ.  
Dei 19. 13.  
Bernardus.  
Gerson enti-  
tiloquio.*

*Gubernare  
est movere ali-  
quos indebitum  
suum, sicut  
navia gubernat  
navem emendo  
eam ad portum.  
Thomas 22.  
Q. 102. 2. co.*

Now this Society may be divided into three sorts, Natural, Civil, Divine or Ecclesiastical. Natural, is that Order and Regiment constituted by God in every mans soul: which consisteth of the Superiority of the Rational faculties, and the Subjection and Obedience of the Inferiour or Sensitive Affections. For Order, as several of the Ancient have described it, is nothing else but The Disposition [or placing] of equal and unequal things into their proper places: which Order is the foundation of Government. And Government (according to *Thomas*) is the moving of men to their due end. There being therefore a twofold end of man; secular and spiritual: Government likewise must be answerable. And both agree in this, viz. to be the Administration of the Weal Publick to ends agreeable unto them. In which we are yet farther to consider these things. 1. The Original of Government. 2. The Form of Government. 3. The Rule and Reasons of Government. 4. The Obligation upon Men under Government. And of these briefly; as a necessary Introduction to the Doctrine of the Church.

And concerning the first, the Cause and Fountain of all Government: Some pretending to fetch the Fountain head of all humane Rule from its first rise, have quite forgot what they went about; and inverting the order of nature, have begun at the end; which is rather the effect, then cause. For now we do not enquire, why, or to what end it is? but who made it, and whose hand it was that framed this Tool to bring to pass such a work as humane safety and tranquility. That this must be the same cause with that of man himself, seems reasonable to me to conclude, from the necessity of the same, and the wisdom of Divine Providence; which having given generally such instinct and common prudence unto Creatures to do nothing which shall serve for nothing: nor to erect any thing, but with competent provision to conserve and continue the same in that being, so far as the Supreme Wisdom shall not oppose the same; How is it credible that God should make that Master-piece of his, Man, upon earth, and not at the same time provide for that subsistence and continuance which are necessary? But it is plain, that man though as brutish, and a sensible creature, he may wear out, possibly an unhappy, ignoble life, yet without society and community and unity, through the bands and ligaments of sound and reasonable Laws, cannot subsist, as civil or rational, or as easily improvable to perfection of natural state upon earth: but must necessarily degenerate into the rank of Brutes. Therefore sure Divine Wisdom left him not destitute of such helps as were proper to this end; but together with his very nature instills into him an inclination to Society; and by his own Act and Ordinance, whereby he ordained that man should propagate and multiply, prescribed the best and only manner of

*Sevorum de  
bestiarum (ino-  
quit Aristote-  
les Polit. 3.  
cap. 6) non  
est Civitas  
quia to mu-  
ti-ty-ny ou-  
mias.*



of civil Regiment; investing some with a natural right of dominion over others: As the man over the woman; and the parents over the children: from whence it is ready and easie to approach to a community, and that with a subordination. This is so plain, that the perspicuity and simplicity doth, rather than any thing else, offend the unsatisfied acuteness of rarer wits; and move them to pry farther to confound themselves, others, and the Order God hath set in the world: beginning at the feet and ending in the head, and putting counsel into the tail to teach the head how it should rule the body: and empowering children to enact Laws for Parents; how they ought to govern; which they certainly do, who affirm that the grosser body of the people did first of all agree upon Government, and constitute their Ruler: which dogmes have no fewer nor higher arguments to confute and oppress them than these. First, they are Ridiculous. Secondly, Sacrilegious and Impious. Thirdly, Impossible. Fourthly, Pestilential and Pernicious to all Government.

It is first ridiculous, as that opinion which inverts all order, and contrary to a much more sound and sober Rule in Politicks; *viz.* That no man can create one greater than himself. And if it be said that therefore no single one can confer greater power than he himself is possessed of on another, but Many who are greater than one, may: I answer, This is true, where the supposition which is here false, and taken for true, is granted; *viz.* That many men have in such cases as these any more power than one. For I wholly deny that any are, or altogether have any right, whatsoever power they may usurp, to create such Powers: And it still remains absurd to suppose that any, or all whose only place and capacity it is to serve, should more then command: For, 'tis a true saying, *It is more to make a King, than to be a King.* For still I hold this which I have not found shaken by the many attempts of innovating Wits; that there is a real Paternal Power in lawful Princes. And though we should suppose that, which was rarely, if ever done, that a man should adopt any man into the place of a Father, as men usually did some, as their sons; yet can we not suppose, that hereby any paternal Power is really conferred on such an one, but only imaginary; and impediments removed whereby Paternal power, which hath an acknowledged common right to Rule, take place over such a person, as hath so submitted unto it. So in like manner, it cannot be denied against innumerable instances to be given; that the People, in certain exigencies and failures, have as it were adopted one man specially as their civil Parent, whom we call commonly a King: and hereupon absurdly and proudly conclude, they have made a King: but we know this to be nothing so. For 'tis not choice, but Power that makes a King: and in this case no power at all is given, or can be given; nor in truth ought to be taken away as the manner is from Princes entering through the populacie, into the Throne. For God only is the proper and immediate Author of Right and Power, which he hath inserted into Parents over their Children; and hath proportionably prescribed to Kings and Princes, without ever advising with the People, or expecting their consent or confirmation: This the Scripture it self calls *Jus Imperii*, or less significantly with us, *The Manner of the King.* Reason calls the same *Justice*: which never takes its measure from earth originally, but from heaven: not from the People, but from God. And that Similitude found in the works of a very judicious and learned man, to shew the Prophets right to institute, at first, Kings, from their right to restore Kingly Power lapsed

Prov. 8. 15.  
Dan. 2. 23.  
*Potestas non  
est apud Elec-  
tores, ergo nec  
ab ipsis datur  
sed ab ipsis ta-  
men certa per-  
sonae applica-  
tur.* Grotius,  
De Imperio  
Summarum  
Potestatis. cap.  
10. §. 2.  
Idem de Jure  
Bel. & Pa. lib.  
3. c. 3. §. 8. 1.  
*Simpliciter  
esse verum ne-  
gat. Populum  
creare Magi-  
stratus.*

Luke 16. 10.

lapsed by reason of the visible Heir to it ceasing; *viz.* That as the Lord of a Mannour resuming the estate of a Tenant whose legal Heirs are unknown to himself, doth argue that it first proceeded from him; so the right of the People to constitute a Prince over them, upon a total cessation of legal Pretenders, do imply, an original right to be in the People of founding *Monarchs*; doth to my apprehension infer the contrary, being better stated. For it sheweth no more than this, That in truth God being the true and proper Lord of the *Mannour*, this dominion is devolved unto him, and not to the People. And that even in such cases a tacit hand of God is seen by many eminent Instances in Histories, designing the Person receiving that Rule; the People being but so many Stewards of Gods Court, in admitting a new Tenant to Kingly Power. *For by me* (saith the Scripture) *Kings reign, and Princes decree Justice.* And the like doth *Daniel* assert to God: *He changeth the times and seasons; he removeth Kings, and setteth up Kings: he giveth wisdom unto the wise, and knowledge, &c.* The most therefore that the People do when they act most in creating Kings is, under God, to apply the Person to the Place or Office of Governing: And therefore in the second place it is no better than Sacrilegiously done by them to mutilate that Power which God hath given by the necessary and common Laws of Natural Justice to Supream Rulers, and transfer of it to themselves: as it would be for a Guardian to an Orphans estate, to pare and pill it, and bestow it on himself; although perhaps out of terrour the consent of the party so defrauded be obtained, lest he should loose all. Yet doth not all this contradict the general practise of Subjects, who having long continued under equal and reasonable Laws, explaining and particularly applying the common Supream Law of Justice to a State or People, do present such Rules of Regiment to their future Prince, for his confirmation: unless they be so far urged on him who hath a Personal Right by Birth to succeed in the Throne, as to deny absolutely to submit to him without such conditions yielded unto. Indeed, could they prove the Right of *Choice* of the Person, to be the same with the *Power* belonging to the Place, they might mangle, alterate, and adulterate it as they pleased: For 'tis a Law, that a man free from Rulers (as these are supposed now to be) may do what he will with his own: and choose whether he will part with any of it, or not; and what, and how much he will give away: but it not being so, and a duty lying upon him of being Just: *He that* (as our Saviour saith) *is unjust in the least, is unjust also in much.*

But thirdly, to shew that there can neither be Divine nor Natural Right in the People to choose or create Governours, and much less Government, the impossibility of the real and just execution of this power abundantly sufficeth. For if men, as some have been so blind and bold to affirm, were naturally free untill they brought this subjection upon themselves: Then first this were general and without exceptions; or but partial, and with exceptions: If this latter be true, and some were naturally subject, This will destroy the principal dogme it self, and open a way to the unanswerable reasons against natural freedom: For that which we have by nature, we have in common, and without exception of the thing it self, though peradventure with some discrimination in the degree and measure. But if the first be granted, That all are free; then must cease of necessity subjection natural of children to their parents; which hath been with better advice and reason received, then it hath by some been well-nigh quite

quite disowned, to the making way for Novel Politicks. And again; Grant that all men were once (but nobody could never tell when) and in a certain place, (but nobody could ever tell where) equally free, or at least, all of years of discretion, which is most uncertain; It would be known first, How men dare to be so presumptuous as to make such a breach of the Law of Nature as this must be; *viz.* To part with their birth-right, and to imbezel that which God had given them, concomitantly with their own lives. I say, what a notorious ingratitude, and an offense against God to alter nature it self, who, we may well suppose, doth all things most consonantly to Divine reason. If therefore men had this Liberty naturally in them, I hold it no less a sin to give it away, than for one to cut off a member of his body, or to destroy ones reason, if it lay in his power. And to say that the People, in such cases, do not absolutely devest themselves of power, nor part with what God and Nature hath placed in them; because they commit only to such the Administration of such power as is resident in them radically; it being neither commodious nor possible for the universal Body to manage it self, to the due ends of civil Society; but reserve unto themselves a right of Revocation, upon the Male-administration, or abuse of Power so delegated: This is to traduce Divince Providence and Wisdom notoriously. For what can be a greater reproach to a wise man, or the most wise God, than to admit such a gross error, as to so constitute and frame a thing to such ends and purposes, which it can never attain; and to endow a people or person with such a faculty which can never avail, nor succeed to the intention of it, and never be executed, as certainly Supream in the People cannot, but must be delivered over to another more capable subject. Thus it seemeth to me that such supposed power ought not to be translated from that subject to which God had annexed it, to that which the people liketh better, man here in mending Gods ordinance. Therefore surely there being found a necessity of having power otherwise posited than in the people; and it being an egregious absurdity of altering that God had ordained; it must follow, to reconcile these things, That there never was any such power in the people at all; but what they have, is unto them derived from another Power originally.

And this is further confirmed from the Impossibility as well as impiety of making any such translation of power from its natural subject, the People; because it cannot ever fairly or justly be brought about: seeing that the People cannot unanimously, much less ever did concur to the Election of any one Government or Governour. They cannot all give in their Votes to such an end; alwayes some were dissenting: and if they did not enter their *Protest* against the proceedings of their fellows, it must be because they were deterred, curbed, and oppressed by a more prevalent faction obliging them, and constraining them most unjustly to comply with their Opinions and Decrees. For there appears no sound reason why a more numerous and powerful faction may not as well take away my Estate, because they are stronger than I, as take away my birth-right, which Liberty is here asserted to be. So that the very first step to Liberty must be founded in injustice, in taking away that from me, which I might no less in natural reason spoil them of: and in servitude too, in bringing me whom they acknowledge to be naturally free, into unwilling subjection. Neither is the difficulty solved in saying, That Reason and Nature also require that for order sake and regulating humane Society, the Minor part must yield to the Major. For upon this supposition indeed that power  
is



is so absurdly and inconveniently posited, there doth presently appear such a necessity: But my Argument is taken from the absurdity of any such necessity of natures creating, that the supposition is very false. And if it were true, yet were not that *Maxime* true which is here brought to controul and correct the same. For Nature doth not teach us, much less necessitate us in any case to follow the most numerous; but rather reason, and experience, and the judgment of diligent and wise discussers of this Point inform us, That the multitude are more inconsiderate, undiscerning, and injudicious, then the fewer in number, many times: the world being generally thicker set with fools, than wise men; and fools, being commonly more apt to be led by fools, than with deeper and sounder reasons of the Wise.

Now as to the right of Revocation resting still in the People, even after the supposed investiture of Power made to a Prince, or other Magistrates; I must confess (upon supposition of a native right in them) it to be very reasonable, yea though the contract be very binding upon them to the securing of the persons so inaugurated, in that State. And that from the grounds already laid down, which prove that no alteration ought to be made contrary to Divine or Natural Institutions; and consequently, the People being by natures Law Proprietaries in that Power, all alienations attempted must needs be void, any farther then they judge fit, yea and farther too; because they themselves are bound to keep themselves to such innate Rights, and observe them duly. And besides Civil and artificial Law, as I may well call *Humane*, can never extinguish Natural, absolutely and justly. And therefore what they gave, the People, they may require back again; because they received that entailed upon them and their Posterity, which they ought not, nor can cut off. And this I say, not being ignorant what others have said to the contrary, who are said to yield supream Power in the body of the People, which they may dispose of to another, but not revoke again, any more than a man may recover back his Estate once lawfully made over to another. But the disparity of the cases makes the answer very easie: which is, That no man being so naturally invested with a temporal estate, as is here supposed the People to be with this Right of Dominion, *that* may without any violation of a superiour Law be parted with, and not *this*. For supposing equally, that God who hath given only a general right to man to possess the earth, and not assigned any particular Lands to particular persons to be holden of Divine Right, had done this latter, it would have followed, That he ought not to sell them; and that such sale made, were void before God: As doth plainly appear in the distribution of the Land of *Canaan* unto several Tribes, by no means to be confounded: and of *entailing* of Lands unto particular Families, by no means so to be alienated, but they might return, at a time prefixed, to the same House.

But the Right of Rule in the People is lookt upon as by Nature and Divine ordinance belonging to them, and therefore cannot [*de Jure*] be transferred; or, if attempted, must needs, by the same Right, be revokable. But I look not upon that Argument much used, as concluding against the pretended power of the People, which stands thus. No man hath power of life and death over himself. Therefore he cannot communicate this power essential to the Supream, to any other. For, is it not possible a man, who hath no such power over himself (as in truth no man hath) may yet have over another, and this give unto another; from a concurrence wherein

wherein One may receive a general dominion over many? But if no man could give the power of Life and Death to another, who cannot dispose of his own Life; How could Kings themselves grant that power to inferior Magistrates, whenas themselves have no power to take away their own lives, neither can they give power to another to take them away?

The last thing to be censured in the doctrine of the Peoples power, is the perniciousness of it to all Empires and States, where it is infused into the minds of the Commonalty, and improved to actions naturally flowing from thence, as experience hath sufficiently proved, as well as reason informed: of which latter (omitting here the odious instances, Histories, and our own senses have ministred unto us) we shall give these three only. First, That if it were true that such Power were radically and revocably in the people, the people never being able to judge with general consent aright of the same thing, nor soberly and quietly to concur to the same conclusion, through the infinite variety and discord found in several free minds, such licence of constituting and repealing their own Acts, must of necessity produce great divisions and confusions amongst them, without any insinuations or instigations of subtiler and more turbulent heads, which do constantly watch and improve such occasions to bring ruin to a Nation, upon some remote contemplation of a possible advantage arising out of the fall of a well-built State. But this perpetual plague of discontented, ambitious Incendaries, both Divine and Politick, plying the common people with language agreeable to their humour, (and nothing ravishes them more than to be told what an interest they have in modelling States) is that which alone suffices to overthrow all order in a Republick: And this we intended for a second Argument. A third, may well be the common and villanous gloss inseparable from such pestilent Principles executed. For the same Histories that relate to us how crafty and seditious Ring-leaders of an enchanted multitude have deluded them, by infusing such false *Dogmes*, do tell us that they finding it impossible to obtain the concurrence of all persons (who according to the pretended Laws of Liberty and Equity ought) as one, to agree in one design, do first with great injustice interpret their Rule to hold and be fulfilled in the Major part of the people only. Then finding themselves most commonly destitute of that advantage, they proceed to expound it more to their purpose tyrannical, and and boldly affirm, *That by the People is not meant necessarily the most, but the best, and soberest, and godliest, and such only that study really the good of Religion, and the Liberties of the People.* And are not these fine doings? Do not these popular tenets hang well together, and end well, which in process of their own reason and practises, confute the very first Principle of all; viz. That People have an absolute Supream Power to frame Governments, when before they can bring matters to their intended conclusion, they are forc't to deny them? But this popular dogme will appear yet as more false, so more odious from what we shall now speak of, the Second Point in this general discourse of Government.

*Ego nunquam  
existimavi u-  
niversi populi  
Judicio eam  
rem [constitu-  
endi reges] per-  
mitti deberi,  
sed ut prope ad  
consuetudinem  
nostram ex  
omnibus ordi-  
nibus Selecti  
ad Regem in  
consilium eai-  
rept. Bucha-  
nanus, De Jure  
Regni apud  
Scotos, pag. 11*

## CHAP. XXV.

*Of the Form of Civil Government. The several sorts of Government. That Government in General is not so of Divine Right, as that all Governments should be indifferently of Divine Institution, but that one especially was instituted of God, and that Monarchical. The Reasons proving this.*

**T**HE Second thing to be here examined is the Form of Government. To speak orderly of which, it is necessary to call to mind the several forms or kinds of Government extant in the World: which though according to the infinite variety of prevailing Factions, may also be infinite; yet may best be reduced to these two, *Monarchy*, or the Supremacy of One presiding over all others within such or such Dominions; and *Polycrasie*, or *Polyarchie*, where many have the power in their hands of administering the Republick. And this again is subdivided into many forms. As *Polycrasie* here properly and strictly taken (not as before, for any number opposite to One, but) for a great number of persons invested with Civil Power. And *Aristocracie*, consisting of a Few comparatively with the others, and them of the Nobler, and richer of the People: And *Democracie*, wherein the People are said to retain the Power of Government in their own hands. But this last is only said, and by some ignorant and undiscerning people phansied to be, rather than in reality is so, or ever was or possible for to be; and that upon the reasons, amongst divers others, already given against the Peoples power. This the Philosopher in his *Politicks*, doth in effect, as far as he dar'd, confess, amidst so many pretenders to it. And they who dispute of it, are constrained to desert the proper genuine sense of the word *Democracie*, which should comprehend the people generally without exclusion of any, and to affix a new meaning to it, whereby many of the inferiour and ignobler sort are taken into the numerous Counsel, and Court of Judicature, administering the Publick: And thus at this cheap rate are the people choused into a fond and empty opinion that they are *some body*, when 'tis not the thousand part of them, who are at all actually concerned in Government. The Histories of the frequent and vain, but fatal attempts made by the *Roman* and *Grecian* Populacie to become Masters of themselves, and to Rule their Rulers, are more than enough to confute any man willing and able to learn what a *Chimera* such a Government is, and what devastations rather than security such presumptions have exposed Cities unto: who, when they were most popularly governed, and so should be most free, never regarded in the least the adjacent peoples freedom, which lived without their City, never admitted their Votes, never advised with them as they ought

to

This Aristotle  
shews Poli-  
ticks lib. 4.  
cap. 4. initio.



to have done, if they would have made good their principles, which teach that Power is of right in the People, and consequently that they ought to govern, and by no violence or fraud ought they to be defeated of this their pretended Birth-right: and they without the Gates in remoter parts are of the same condition with Citizens. And if they recur to the old hold of the Patrons of such natural Rights in people, to say, That, notwithstanding them, there must be some over-ruling power to bring things into settlement, and order; and therefore, the universal judgment and approbation of every person must not be expected: I as easily reply, and more strongly conclude, That therefore there can be no such natural Right in them so much as to prescribe to themselves; it being most ridiculous to affirm, as well as dishonorable to God, to believe, That the All-wise Providence should so dispose of Power, that unless humane wit mended it, nay, quite changed it, it could never be exercised to the benefit of mankind.

And this being made good, not only must this Democracie be found a meer imposture upon people, but the pretended Right of Government communicated unto the Chief in the other two *Species's* of Government, Aristocracie and Polycracie. For these persons must either profess a right growing up unto them from the powerful usurpations and oppressions made by them over their brethren, the rest of the people, who naturally and justly were, and ought to be as free as themselves (and so all the frame is founded in injustice) or this was freely communicated unto them from the people. But against this is sufficient what we have often both said and shewed before, That the People never had any such Power, and if they had, ought not, nor could part with it, or remove it from that place and proper subject wherein it was by God seated and settled. And therefore none of these can be just or natural: for nothing that is unjust can be natural, or agree with the Divine Will.

And from hence is refuted the vulgar Warrant that is used to justify, as indifferent in their kind, all sorts of Civil Government, telling us, That God hath instituted Government in General, but not limited it to any one kind, but left it to the wisdom and choice of men to pitch upon what Government best agrees with a Nation. But to what mens wisdom? to some few? or to many? or to all men of that Nation? All, or the major part have no wisdom, nor possibility to choose: Few, or many choosing doth manifest injustice to the others. But what needs repetition of what is said quite opposite to all this? This therefore is only here to be added, That the supposition here made is utterly false, and incongruous to the nature of all things else constituted by God, and contrary to the course of nature, and Gods manner of working, which apparently is not to begin with Generals, and so to proceed to Particulars: but first he makes Particulars, and creates only [*Individuums*] *single beings*: and by a necessary consequence, whatever existence the General Nature hath, it borroweth from thence. As God did not at first make man in General, and then left some body else (as they thought) to make *Adam* and *Eve* and the rest: nor did he first and only make a living Creature in General, and then left the Angels, or some other unknown Creatures to us, to make what special Animals they pleased out of that: but he first made *Adam*, and so mans nature was made. He first made the Sun and Moon (so far as we read) and upon that followed, that he made great Lights. And the like method must of necessity be acknowledg'd in Gods Institutions Moral and Civil: and

he must inevitably (so far as humane wit can reach) first ordain some one Government in particular, before he could be said to be the Author of Government generally taken.

Now if it doth not at all appear, That God had any more than a common hand (whereby evil as well as good doth spring up in the World) in the institution of any more than one sort of Government; and that he did particularly pitch upon one, and gave instances and intimation of his choice of one, and nothing can be alleadged in behalf of the opposite to that, as proceeding, in any direct special manner, from him, then will the form of Government, we now seek after, commend it self unto us. And this we shall do by giving the Divine Prerogatives, which Monarchical Government hath above others invented by man, to stand in competition with it. And this not by wading deep, or wandring far into an uncertain and tedious Disputation of finding out reasons on both sides, which may seem to commend and prefer one above another, and so consequently to conclude a divineness in one especially; but by certain visible indications and motives evidencing this to every imprejudic'd mind. And they are these.

First, Consider we that simple and imperfect Regiment, which is found in *Animals*, and there will appear a resemblance of this Monarchical power only, as in herds of Deer, and Cattle, and Bees, in which is observed the Superiority of one over all, so far as there is any subjection at all. Yea, St. *Cyprian*, and divers other Fathers writing against Gentile Idolatry, do prove the Monarchy of God over all the World, from the Unity of Inanimate things, as the Sun in the firmament raining, as it were, over all the other Celestial Bodies.

Secondly, The more proper and refined Law of Nature written in mens heart, and inclining them to this kind of Government only, do not a little argue the hand of God in its institution. That being received for a Law of God natural, to which all people without syncretizing, consulting, or combining mutually, do consent and practise. Now it is evident, so far as any History doth inform us, That all Nations were at first governed by a single person. And whereas *Nimrod* is reported by some, first to have usurped Regal Power over men, because the Scriptures tell us, how he was a *mighty hunter before the Lord*, it hath more of phansie than substance in it: Yet possibly he might be the first that collected many petty Princes of Families together, constraining them to lay aside their Domestick Monarchy, and to be subject unto him: Or that he brought his neighbour Princes all to his Dominion, and so became a Tyrant over them. And at this day, if we advise with those People in both *Indies* discovered, we shall find that they scarce ever heard of any other Government but that of Monarchy, and that almost Paternal, being extended to very few Persons, compared with the multitude of which Kingdoms or Governments generally consist. And in truth, it may give some repue to the Government of many that Christian Religion favoureth it: but it can give no credit to Christian Religion, That it only practises and acknowledges a different way of Ruling people from all the known world besides. For it will be hard to find any other but Regal Power out of *Europe*: and in *Europe*, not the tenth part owning Antimonarchical Government. And of those that do differ from Monarchical Power, not two agreeing in the same form, but only negatively against a single Persons Supremacy. So that we may see they have no general Rule to go by, but every Nation are a Rule to themselves.

Thirdly,

*Natura enim commenta est Regem, quod ex aliis animalibus licet cognoscere: ex apibus, quarum regi amplissimum cubile est, mediocriter ac tutissimo loco.* Seneca de Clement. lib. 1. cap. 9. Vide etiam Hieron. Epist. 4. Isidorum. Penulat. Epist. lib. 2. ep. 216. Origen. cont. Cels. lib. 4. pag. 217. Basil. Ma. Hom. 8. in Hexaem. Chrysost. in Rom. Sermon. 23. pag. 189.

Thirdly, the Paternal Power being acknowledged to be natural, and of Divine institution, and differing from Monarchical and Regal, but as [*Magis* and *Minus*] the lesser degree doth from the greater, the thing is in a manner yielded.

But fourthly, Divine Presidents and Examples do further confirm this, and that taken from the Word of God; in all which there is no mention at all made of any Government but Regal, though not alwayes under that name. For, before the children of *Israel* went into *Egypt*, the Father or Patriarch of them had this power without competitor. In the Captivity, and Servitude of *Egypt*, they had no publick Government besides that of the Kings of *Egypt*, unless peradventure every Tribe had a Chief by succession over them, without any Civil Authority. From their departure out of *Egypt* to the death of *Josuah*, the Supremacie was in one; notwithstanding subordinate Councils and Rulers constituted by *Moses*. After *Josuah*, arose Judges by Gods special appointment, not many at once, thereby framing an Aristocracie, but one Eminent person giving Law to all others. And these differed from that of more formal Regal Persons instituted by God at the desire of the discontented people, in that before *Saul*, God kept the choice of their Governours more immediately in his own hand, and ordained them Deliverers and Judges according to his pleasure, and occasions offered: which was the reason (together with their rejecting of so eminent a Servant of God, as was *Samuel*) that God said of the People, *they had rejected him rather than Samuel*. From *Saul* to the Captivity, it is manifest what their Government was; and from thence it matters not, as to our present purpose, how they governed themselves, seeing they were ruled by the Regal Power of Foreign Princes: until shaking off that yoke, they were brought under that form by their own Deliverers, which was again extorted from them by usurping Tyrants. So that when *Philo-Judæus* and *Josephus* seem to write of an Aristocratical Government instituted by *Moses*, they can no otherwise be understood to write faithfully, but in reference to Ecclesiastical Courts, and Cases of Religion, purely; wherein the Counsel of many was to take place, but not to the administration of Civil Justice, unless, as is above-said, when they were themselves subject to Forrain Princes.

1 Sam. 8. 10.

The Objections against this Form thus asserted, I leave to be answered from the positive grounds thus laid down: And commend the Reader to the learned Disputations of others, which are many, concerning the excellencie and benefits of one Form above another. But as to Hereditary and Elective Governments, what is convenient may be gathered from the general discourse now made: Now we proceed to the Third thing in Government, the mutual Obligation of Governour and Governed.



## CHAP. XXVI.

*Of the mutual Relations and Obligations of Sovereigns and Subjects. No Right in Subjects to resist their Sovereigns tyrannizing over them. What Tyranny is. Of Tyrants with a Title, and Tyrants without Title. Of Magistrates Inferiour and Supream, the vanity and mischief of that distinction. The Confusion of Co-ordinate Governments in one State. Possession or Invasion giveth no Right to Rulers: The Reasons why.*

1 Cor. 5. 12.

**T**HAT we read not in the New Testament of any Rules or Advice given to Kings and Princes, how to govern the people under them, the reason is plain, *viz.* Because in those dayes there were none Christian: and St. Paul says, *What have I to do to judge them that are without?* the Church: For doubtless, had any been of the Society of Christians, they had fallen under the Christian Discipline and Precepts of the Apostles: But that occasion of instructing Kings in the due administration of their power, failing, we are to seek for satisfaction from the old Testament: where not much is found, besides general moral Precepts of Sobriety, Temperance, Justice, and the like enjoyned Solomon by David his Father; and left by Solomon in his Book of *Proverbs* for Rules to succeeding Princes. Moses likewise, not without Gods appointment, hath drawn up some special Precepts for Kings to follow, in the real and cordial embracing of Gods word and worship: and taking the defense and protection thereof. Of which to speak, it little behoves us at present.

Ephes. 6. 8.

Neither purpose we out of Humane Arguments and Authority, to prescribe to Supreams what they ought to do, or how to govern any farther than the known Rules of Justice in common do require: For, no doubt there is a mutual Obligation between Sovereign and Subject, and that he is tyed and circumscribed in the exercise of his power, by God; as really, as this is in his Obedience to him: and that upon the common duties expressed by St. Paul of Masters to Servants, and Husbands to Wives, and Parents to Children. For it doth not at all follow, That because Princes are not subject to their Subjects, therefore they are free from all subjection. No, St. Paul's Rule holds good to Kings as well as to Masters, *viz.* That they should know that their King and Master is in heaven: and that Kings are to be subject as well to the Laws of God, as their Subjects are to the Laws of Man. And though Children ought to obey their Parents in all things: yet there is tacitly understood certain Laws of Limitation restrain-

restraining the boundless tyranny of both civil and natural Parents. For Subjects and Children are to know that they have a higher Lord, and a more powerful Father, to whom in the first place obedience must be paid. And we must withdraw our selves from the commands of our Earthly Sovereign, when our Heavenly, who is his Sovereign, doth require it: as all rational Kings do grant, as well as People.

But neither ought we to restrain the will of Princes to the literal and express will of God only, but even to the most just and reasonable Laws of Humane Authority: but only we must distinguish the vast difference between the obligation of Subjects to the just and equal Laws prescribed and imposed on them, and that of Princes, in relation to those Laws concerning their governing. For all Laws contain two special causalities in them: The one Exemplary, whereby a Form and Rule is prescribed, directing such as are to be guided thereby, to the observation of Justice, Equity, and Reason; as well to the publick as private good: And to this (so far as it is reasonable) Kings are no less bound than Subjects: they ought to observe entirely and religiously these sound and profitable Laws, and that under pain of Gods displeasure. The other causality which Laws have, is Efficient and Compulsive; whereby a Civil penalty being denounced, and impending over the head of the infringers thereof, they are better guarded from transgressions, by either loss of outward good, or life it self, according to the merit of the Offense.

It cannot either consist with the Law of God or Nations, to inflict punishments on Princes Sovereign. Not but that, for instance, murder, adultery, unjust spoil, and robbery of the Subjects, may no less (considering the nature of the Crime) deserve such punishment of Princes, as they do of People; but because there is none in such cases that can, or ought duly and regularly to execute such Laws, because there can be no such execution without the power of the Sword; and there can be but one proper subject of that power in any one Republick. Every man must not put to death him that is a notorious offender, no not though he be justly and legally condemned to dye; but he, or they only who are thereunto rightly impowred and authorized by the Supream: And though every man may in his own mind and judgment, sentence a malefactor whose crime is high and apparent, to death; yet cannot he in civil judicature, render him obnoxious to it. And the reason hereof is plain, because *Justice* must be done *justly*, or else there is incurred no less guilt than is fought, and intended to be revenged. And of all guilt, I know not whether any be greater than the assuming of such a power, which no wayes belongs to a man. For better it were to take away ones horse, or to ravish another mans wife, or to extort unjustly anothers estate, than to devest a Prince of his Right of Rule, and usurp it to himself; and that, first, because no mans estate, or any thing that is his, doth descend to him, or otherwayes becomes his, by the like Divine title as the Supream Power rightly posited and possessed, doth to the owner thereof: and, therefore this being more sacred, the invasion of this right is much more wicked and unjust. Secondly, Because a publick mischief, and of general influence upon all, is much more intolerable than a private. But such a violation of Princely Right, must of necessity draw on a publick mischief upon the whole civil Body; I mean, all the Subjects in such a Nation, who shall be distracted between the sense of obedience known other-  
wise

wife to be due, and the terrour of usurped Power threatning ruin to such as comply not with their injustice.

This being so necessary and convincing a truth unto most men of competent reason, though incompetent conscience, they have sought out an evasion, which, as occasion may serve, may unqualifie Princes, and ennoble and enable Subjects to oppose in hostile manner the tyrannies, as they call them, of Princes. And the one strikes high, and through the loyns of all Supremacie in single Persons; affirming that one man is not capable of such a mass of power, without apparent tyranny. And as for manifest tyranny, no great scruple, they think, ought to be made in repressing and curbing it, and reducing it into its proper bounds. This must be refuted by a more reasonable and sober judgment of tyranny. For 'tis a gross and dangerous mistake to look upon tyranny with such a vulgar and evil eye, as to conceive that Plinipotence and illimited Power is presently tyranny: And that tyranny is not so much the abuse and unjust exercise of power (which is the truest description of it) but power it self; and that it is not separable from some kind of Government, as that which is absolute and unconfin'd by Laws. But the first thing here supposed, and so commonly and boldly taught, is very false. For there is no such thing as a Government in it self tyrannical: and there is no one of all those which have been, or may be invented, but may equally be subject to that imputation. And to be brief, there can no possible reason be given why the Government of one should be tyranny, rather than that of many, of a Senate. Or, why people should not be said more truly to be free under that, than this; the Laws being more benign and equal there than here? as who can deny but they may be, whatever actually they are? Nay, we see, that where most plausibly and gloriously Liberty is pretended by Governours, and presumed on by the credulous multitude, there commonly the yoke of obedience is most heavy: and that a bold affirmation of a Free people prevails to the perswasion of men, that so in truth they are, contrary to common sense: And all this chiefly from that fundamental Error, taken for an unquestionable truth; *viz. That to be governed by many is a state of Freedom; and by a single Person, of tyranny.* But tyranny is not proper to any one kind of Government, whether consisting of one, or more: It is in brief, no Government at all, but the excess and corruption of Governing; and is in it self equally incident to all kinds; however, where Learning most flourished of old, that extrem hath been, as it were, appropriated to one, the better surely to secure the hold which many Usurpers possessed themselves of; commonly taking occasion from the miscarriages of such persons as were the managers of Power, to invade Government themselves.

Ἐπὶ παρῆ-  
κασι τῶν  
ὑπὸν πολλ-  
την. Arist.  
lib. 3. Polit.  
cap. 4. & 5.

And if it be a true and reasonable distinction of Tyrants into *Titled* and *Titleless*; how is it possible, those great, many, and zealous assertours of Popular Liberty, and invaders of Government, (as *Junius Brutus* with his Fellows) should escape the due censure of the worst of Tyrants, who expelling a Tyrant who had a Title, usurped a power, to which he had no Title; and then proceeded to exercise an act, to which he had no power; *viz.* the thrusting out of his Equal and Colleague, collating, because, possibly he might have afterward committed an offense, not that he had. This was a piece of tyranny, not exceeded by any before him. But it may be alledged, That there is a Law, whereby it was free for any man to kill Tyrants; and some late Demagogues have written, for the promotion



promotion of Religion (forsooth) as well as Civil Liberty, that to kill Tyrants (and here I will not show whom they call Tyrants) is as good an act, as to slay Wolves, Lyons, and Bears. But I would fain know, whence such a Law proceeded, if not from tyranny it self? Even such persons, who, under colour of natural Law of returning evil for evil, and self preservation, have done the greatest injustice imaginable, not only against the person persecuted, but the people, who never at any time had power so to deliver themselves, nor, if they had, did generally and unanimously, or could confer the same on the new Pretenders to it. That Law therefore of killing Tyrants, invented by Tyrants, taketh place on the Authors of it, as much as any body else; and, where the like power can be snatched up, may have the same event on popular States-men, as well as Kings and Princes: For they are Tyrants too.

Buchananus  
De Jure Regni  
apud Scotos.

The other ground of Resistance of Supremacie abused by a single Ruler, is commonly taken from a supposed right in Inferiour Magistrates, (as they are vulgarly called) to restrain the exorbitancies, and chastise the fury of immoderate Princes. This invention hath so much more of speciousness than the former, by how much there is a sound of Authority, and hope of greater order, and prudence, and formality of Justice, than could be expected from a disorderly, ignorant, loose and precipitant multitude: But being examined duly, will be found very rotten, and vain. For, as hath been well observed before me, and is easie to be apprehended by the meanest capacity, Magistrates here, are no more than common people: it being plain, That no man can be properly termed a Magistrate or Governour, but as he hath power and authority either derived, or originally in himself, over others; and not as he is himself subject unto another. Therefore any person bearing the name and office of a Magistrate, though he be called also a *Peer*, is no more than a Subject, in relation to him who gave him that power and dignity. And having no power but what he received, and having received no power but to such and such ends and purposes, (and no man did ever intend to enable another to offer violence or injury to himself) to disown a power borrowed, and to make it absolute; and to draw the Sword of Justice against him that first put it into his hands, is not only base ingratitude, but as notorious rebellion, as if any of the vulgar rank should do the same.

Grotius, De  
Imperio sum-  
marum Pat.

St. Paul doth indeed require good Christians to make supplications, prayers, and intercessions, and giving thanks for all men: For Kings, and all that are in authority, &c. which hath been so understood by some, as if he had intended here, to distinguish and establish a co-ordination of Governours over the same people; but there is no necessity at all of such a consequence: and St. Peter expressly distinguisheth their relations, not to be co-ordinate but subordinate, saying; *Submit your selves to every ordinance of man*, (that is, not, as some weakly and presumptuously would interpret the Apostle, as if Kings and Princes were mens creatures, and by them constituted, but humane Creature (which is the word in the Original) doth signifie such Persons as have authority over men, as men, and not as Christians, such as were then Civil Governours amongst the Gentiles, which the phrase of the Jews commonly called *Creatures* barely; and *Humane*, as having no such Divine Graces conferred on them, as had the Jews) *for the Lords sake, whether it be unto Kings as Supream, or unto Governours, as unto them that are sent by him, for the punishment*

1 Tim. 2.1, 2.

1 Pet. 2.13, 14.

nishment of evil doers, and for the praise of them that do well. Here Governours are said to be of two sorts, (not co-ordinate and subordinate; but ) Supream and Subordinate: such as have authority immediately and absolutely in themselves, without dependence upon others, and such as are of an Inferiour order, and under the said Supream, rule and execute Justice. So that nothing can be more absurdly and sediciously taught than to make such as are constituted by another, to have any authority at all over their Founder and Lord, the author of their power.

I know infinite instances may be brought of Common-wealths which have admitted, and been governed by such a Co-ordination, or at least a power reserved in store in the hands of certain persons, whose proper office and care it should be, to regulate and reduce to a safe mean, the extreams which single and absolute Monarchs may easily fall into. But all these varying so exceedingly from the natural form of Government, sway not much with me. For that which is natural, and of Divine Ordinance and Institution, cannot possibly be uncertain and mutable, so that no man shall be able to know where to place his duty of Obedience, which God requires to be paid to such as are in Authority: And obedience being due only to the Supream himself immediately, or to those that derive authority from him, how is it possible to understand, but by the sad effects of power pressing and afflicting a man, where he is to yield his obedience. Therefore surely God can have no hand in such modellings of States which shall perplex a man in rendring his subjection. For it is not a great, empty, and ridiculous Title which maketh a Supream, but entire power, and absolute freedom at least from subjection to others, especially of his own Dominion. All Titles without this, are honourable Mockeries: but the real Supremacy is actual (I say not how justly or injuriously, in those Tutours of Princes and Keepers of the Liberties of the people, as is commonly given out: and in this case (supposing that Right and Power are not separated) not these Proveditors or Senatours, who thus chastise Princes are rebellious, but they who bearing the name of Kings and Princes, being in truth but meer subjects, refuse to submit to the decrees of their Superiours.

But if possession giveth not Right, which is the most Christian, as well as rational opinion, it may be doubted how a just title can be acquired by any Persons in co-ordination to the Supream power, when as we have shown, the People never had any such themselves, and therefore can transferr none; nor such select persons had any of themselves, who assume this, nor is it to be conceived how any natural Right should descend upon many persons, as the Paternal power doth upon one, from whence Monarchical Power and Right may flow. And If Senatours as they call them, or such like States-men cannot regularly found their title in nature, or Divine Writ, or revelation, It was no act of Rebellion, that greatest act of Hostility in *Julius Caesar*, to reduce the Roman Common-wealth to Monarchy. For there are two things to be considered in Civil Authority, The Government it self in its form and kind; and the Governour invested with this. The Person Governing may doubtless offend notoriously, though I dare not say forfeit to any other his Authority: but the Government it self being abused cannot be in fault, or for any miscarriages of the Person, lapse to other. The Government is religiously to be observed and secured from adulterations and corruptions, even when the Monarch is irreligiously discarded and dethroned. So that the Tyranny of

a single person invading the Government administred by States, and arrogating the Supremacy to himself alone, must needs be less criminal than for many conspiring into a Common-wealth, to change both Person and Government from the Natural to the Artificial, and meerly of Humane invention and pleasure.

Now that Possession doth not alwayes include a Title, nor Might, Right, in Civil Affairs, is both most reasonable and Christian to believe. Reasonable from several heads: First, from the notoriousness of the mischiefs which croud in upon all Societies of Men, where this Tenet is received. For what a powerful motive will it be to all discontented persons to invade others and dispossess them, when there lies no other difficulty before them, but the means to attach successfully, whom they intend to destroy; but having overcome that, by whatever villainies, they shall be reputed as legal owners of what they are become Masters, as the most innocent and just person of all. But can ever any peace, or security be expected by that Society wherein it shall be lawful for any man to intrude himself into Power? No, say some, Power acquired and possessed doth give Right to hold, but not justifie the Act of inordinate acquiring the same: But if it be true in Logick, That the Conclusion doth alwayes partake of the weakness of the Premisses: and in Nature, That an evil cause, be it but of the nature of a Circumstance, corrupteth the whole effect, is it not altogether as rational, that such an hainous act in the acquiring such Power here, should quite marr the effect? *Who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean? not one;* saith holy *Job.* So not one can, by an unrighteous Act produce a righteous effect. Neither can the inveterateness of an Evil any wayes mitigate the same; nor tract of time wipe away that Guilt which was at first acquired: For prescription in such cases never gives just Title, but where other Titles are extinguished, which is by accident. Then indeed Possession it self giveth not a good Title, but hath less evil and inconvenience than that attempt which hath neither one, nor other.

Secondly, From whence comes the difference made between private spoils and robberies, and publick; that the one should once and alwayes remain unjust, the other not? This would be known.

Thirdly, How irrational and intolerable must that Dogme be which degradeth humane order and claims, into them, of beasts and reasonless Creatures? Is it not to be supposed by all pretenders to Reason, That Reason is the proper and noble principle of man, whereby he is distinguished from meer Animals? And can any man find a more sound principle, or more essential to humane Society, than Justice? Now if Title or Right to a thing be the same with possession, and never fails to succeed upon that; what advantage hath man above beast in his acquisitions? Or what reason hath not a beast to endeavour to make prey of all he can master? Indeed he hath much more reason than man acting after this manner, seeing he doth proceed therein according to that Law of natural instinct and impulse given unto him, and hath no more superiour principle than self-preservation to direct him otherwise: but man hath; and therefore neglecting, or contemning that for advantage unnecessary, becomes more vile and brutish in his doings than beasts themselves, to whom it is as natural to live one upon another, as for men to live in Society under the direction of reason, and protection of common Justice.

Job 14. 4.  
Reſte factum  
eſt ut id quod  
male ceptum  
eſt Autoritate  
Publica deſtru-  
eretur. Dama-  
ſus. Epist. A-  
cholio, Eury-  
dico, &c. apud  
Holſtennii  
Colleſionem  
pa. 40. Part. 1.



Fourthly, Humane and Civil Society require some Rule according to which it ought to be framed and administred. Now either this Rule can be known, or it cannot be known: If it cannot be known, it is all one as if it were not extant at all, because that which is unknown cannot possibly have any influence upon a man: But if this rule of humane life and actions is only in power, and no establisht right of Justice, it must of necessity vary according to might and strength in the possessor of Dominion: which being uncertain, and every day almost changing, a man should stand obliged to accommodate his obedience answerable to the degrees of Power, and so sometimes should be bound to give obedience to the fourth degree, which we here suppose to be the highest, sometimes to a third, sometimes to the second, and sometime to one onely, and these degrees being absurd and obscure to him, he must of necessity be perplexed and undetermined in his resolutions.

Lastly, To add no more, the inverting of the argument brought against fixt obedience upon the score of Justice, from Gods omnipotence over the Creature, makes much more against mutable obedience. For whereas it is supposed (not at all so much as offered to be proved) that the ground of our obedience to God is laid in his Omnipotence, and we are bound to serve and obey him because we cannot otherwise choose; This is grossly false: For though God be of such infinite and absolute power as he could compel us to obedience, even against our resolutions and will, yet in truth he doth not, but, as is apparent, leaves us at Liberty either to obey, or rebel against him. And if obedience were only due where power constrains, or fear of evil impels a man; then where no actual force were upon a man, and where he could carry his offence so well that he feared no evil, there he owed no actual obedience because as the habit of Authority doth answer the habitude of obeying, so the act of obeying must answer the act of power; which being not exercised, neither should it be needful to exercise any act of obeying. But further, Power in God doth not properly or immediately entitle him to the service and worship of the Creature. For though all things proceed originally from the power of God, yet from his good-will and pleasure actuating his remoter power, do all things take their being and subsistence, and provision immediately; and therefore from hence much rather than from that, are we to take an estimate of our obedience; and where brutality and monstrosities have not so far confounded and debauched mens understandings, as to deny themselves to be men (which they do who destroy all principles of knowing and doing) this must be received as a sure ground; *viz.* That every man must have his due, and his due is his own, and therefore our very beings proceeding from God, our preservation and provision being the effect of his good Providence towards us, if there be any reason of mens actions in the world, this must of necessity be such, that what we have received of God, we should acknowledge to be received of him; and apparent Justice (more than Power) requires we should return God his own, so far as we are able: Now our very *beings* we cannot without violation of his will, who gave them to continue according to his will, not our own: Therefore so far as we can, we are bound to a recognition of him, out of Justice, were there no such thing as power to constrain us; or else we should do him wrong in detaining his due from him: and this Recognition improved is nothing but Religion. And hitherto relateth the argument of the Apostle

St.

St. Paul, saying; *What? know ye not that your body is the Temple of the Holy Ghost, which is in you, which ye have of God, and ye are not your own, &c.* From this one ground the Apostle argueth, viz. *Ye are not your own*: being made by God, and not by your selves; and possessed by the Holy Spirit, in Gods Right; and purchased by a price after ye had (as far as in you lay) made away your selves, so that ye are not your own, not at your own disposing; the Justice of the cause is manifest, that therefore ye ought to render what ye are, and what ye have thus received to the Author of All, God Almighty, and that by Religious observance of his will. And this in proportion holds in matters Civil, between Prince and Subject. For though (as hath been said) all things proceed primarily from God, yet subordinately we are owing to the benign Influence humane Authority hath over men, to keep them in due bounds, so that one preyeth not upon, nor spoileth another: For to this profitable protection, is justly due submission and obedience: For there are three general Arguments couched in the Apostles exhortation to obedience in the thirteenth Chapter to the *Romans*. 1. Fear of mischief and evil, v. 3. *Wilt thou not be afraid of the power? do that which is good.* 2. Expectation of benefit from it, v. 4. *He (the Magistrate) is the Minister of God for good to thee.* 3. And lastly, *for conscience sake*; which was the second Argument mentioned above, and intended to lead to obedience to Civil Powers. And Conscience having for its rule, not only natural and common Justice, but the revealed and written will of God, it may suffice to have alledged testimonies out of Gods Word already confirming this duty, and to leave others to every ingenuous Christians diligent use of it, to avoid prolixity. And for the objections which may be made, and are commonly found against what is above delivered, for the same reason I pass them over; as likewise because I intend not here Controversie, but Positive Institutions.

1 Cor. 6. 19,  
20.

Psalm. 100.

Rom. 13. 1, 2,  
3, 4, 5.

## CHAP. XXVII.

*An Application of the former Discourse of Civil Government to Ecclesiastical. How Christs Church is alwayes visible, and how invisible. Of the Communion of Christ and his Members. The Church of Christ taken specially for the Elect, who shall infallibly be saved, never visible. But taken for true Professours of the Faith, must alwayes be visible, though not Conspicuous, in comparison of other Religions or Heresies.*

**T**HE Reasons moving me to insist a while upon Civil Government, before I entred upon Ecclesiastical, are, First, because I find Authors of the grounds of Christian Religion to treat of the same generally. Secondly, because, where breaches have been made often in the Faith and Discipline of the Church; there, necessary provision ought to be made to secure them for the future; but for want of due understanding of this Doctrine, licentious zeal blinded with presumption hath transported very many into unchristian practises. Thirdly, because it is a necessary introduction to the more clear and compendious pursuing of our subject of the Spiritual Society of the Church of Christ, and particularly its Form.

The Form of Christs Church may be distinguished according to the vulgar Notion, into invisible and visible; or inward and outward. Invisible we here call that which doth not at all offer it self to our outward sense of seeing, cannot be beholden with our eye: Or that which may in some manner appear to our sight, but not as a Church of Christ, though in truth it so may be. According to the first acception of invisible, we understand the Body Mystical of Christ, consisting of himself the only proper Head, the Holy Spirit animating and influencing the same, and the particular members of the holy, most happy invisible Spirits in heaven, and Saints on earth spiritually united to them by Christ in the divine band of holiness. And hitherto do the words of the Apostle to the Ephesians seem to be applyed; saying, *Having made known the mystery of his will*——— *That in the dispensation of the fulness of times, he might gather together in one all things in Christ, both which are in heaven, and which are in earth, even in him:* signifying hereby the mystical conjunction of Men and Angels in Christ Jesus: although there are who not improbably and more literally do understand these words only of the collection and uniting of Jews, (who in respect of their peculiar exaltation to Gods service and

Ephes. 1.9, 10.



and favour, are stiled in Scripture *heavenly* compared with the Gentiles) and Gentiles into one Faith, and Church of Christ, which therefore divers times is called a Mystery, as *Romans* the 16. 25, 26. *Ephes.* 3. v. 3, 4, 5. *Col.* 1. 26, 27. *1 Tim.* 3. 16. because, as is there expressed, it was an hidden and incredible thing to the Jews, that the Gentiles should be taken into the like priviledges and rights of serving God, as were once esteemed incommunicable to any so fully as to the Jews. But whether the Scripture, according to its most genuine and literal sense, intendeth at any time to comprehend into one Society, Angelical Beings, and Humane, as the Church of Christ, as I do not find (though the Ancients as well as Modern have held such an opinion) so do I not oppose; the Mystery of which we now speak being sufficiently verified in the preternatural and invisable conjunction of Christ and his Church, in the indissoluble bands of his Spirit, guiding the members thereof into all sufficiency of Grace here, and immortal absolute glory hereafter in heaven.

To understand this co-union or conjunction of Christ and his Members the better, we are to call to mind a threefold union intimated in holy Writ unto us. First a conjunction of Nature when more are of the same individual nature: as the three Persons in the Holy Trinity are united in the same Divine Nature, though in themselves distinct; which is so proper to that mystery of the Trinity, that it is not to be found elsewhere, no not in that intimate communion we now speak of, between Christ and his Members, their natures continuing distinct. Again, another conjunction proper to Christian Religion is the union of two natures into one Person; as in the Mystery of Christs incarnation, when the humane and divine Nature become one, so far as to constitute but one Person, Christ Jesus: So do not Christ and his Church. But by a third way are Christ and his Church united into one aggregate Spiritual Body or Society; which is effected by his Spirit, which yet do not make properly a Part of that Body, but by its manifold divine Graces do produce and conserve the same: Christ thereby and his Church being, as *St. Paul* saith, *One Spirit. He that is joyned unto the Lord is one Spirit.* And *St. John* likewise saith, *Hereby we know that we dwell in him, and he in us, because he hath given us of his Spirit.*

1 Cor. 6. 17.

This truly, and only in a proper sense is invisable, and that alwayes: and hath two Parts, the triumphant in Heaven, which is a most perfect, pure, holy, and blessed Society which have through the blood of the Lamb and the power of his Spirit, overcome the three grand Enemies, Sin, Death, and the Devil, and reaped the fruits of their sufferings and labours; all tears being wiped from their eyes, all sorrows being fled away, all temptations for ever conquered, and ceasing to molest them. Now this part of Christ's Church remains alwayes *invisibile* unto us here below.

And as for the other Part which is called Militant, and are described to be *A number of faithful and elect people living under the Cross, and aspiring towards the perfection of Grace and Glory hereafter, supposing at present what may hereafter be farther discussed; viz.* That such a peculiar number of holy persons there are within the visible Church of Christ, which shall infallibly attain to everlasting bliss in heaven; yet neither are these, as such, at any time visible or discernable to our common senses. It being scarce, if at all, possible to judge infallibly who shall be saved, and who shall not be saved: it being much more difficult for

for any man to be assured of another mans salvation, than of his own: seeing that, as is said, hereunto an inward testimony of Gods Spirit is required, which is the ground of that sound hope which is commonly called Assurance; but the Promises of God in holy Scripture do not extend in like manner to the assuring of any man that another shall be saved, as that he himself shall; or that anothers faith shall not fail as that his own shall not; but thus far only probably a truer and more certain sentence may be pronounced by others, who are ordained of God to be judges of our state of Grace, upon the discovery of our consciences to them, then can be by our selves; which is sufficient: but of the unalterableness of that state no man can certainly affirm any thing. Which holdeth true likewise as to the contrary state of Damnation. For though a more than probable judgment may be made of the state of Damnation of him who continues impenitently in notorious sins, yet may no man pronounce a peremptory sentence against any such person, that he inevitably shall be damn'd; because he cannot see into the abstruse Counsels of Almighty God so far, as to deny a Liberty left in him to confer such efficacious grace upon such a notorious offender as may reduce him to God; no more than withdraw grace from him who at present standeth in all probable way of perseverance.

This being so, it followeth from hence necessarily, That the Church of Christ, taken for the so faithful and elect, that they shall without all peradventure attain the Crown of the Triumphant, is, evermore in its own nature, invisible, that is, not to be distinguished by us, nor known certainly; and if so, then in vain and to no purpose at all are such Disputations as are made about the invisible Church, in that sense of invisibility which signifies that which can in no manner appear certainly to us.

The other sense of invisibleness, according to which a thing is possible to be seen, is an object of sense, but actually is either not to be seen, or with very great difficulty. For as in Philosophy, it is with *Divisibility*; so may it be with *Visibility* in Divinity. Everything that hath Quantity, according to the Philosopher, is divisible or is capable of being divided into lesser parts, even without end: but yet so small may the parts so divided become at last, that no Artist shall be able to cut them any more in pieces. So may we understand a thing to be *visible*, which is so small and inconsiderable, that actually it can hardly, if at all, be perceived: But visible and palpable being taken for things which not only affect the senses simply, but with some more than common notoriety; the usual question, Whether the Church of Christ is alwayes visible, ought to be understood of such a competence of perspicuity as may ordinarily be discerned by persons rightly disposed in their understandings; taking here, *right disposition* of our inward apprehensions, in a proportionable manner to that which relates to our common outward senses; which if it be called into doubt, (as it may) no wonder that the other may be, and that without remedy.

Now according to the most strict acceptation of *Visible*, for whatsoever may possibly be discerned, the resolution will be easie, That Christs Church is, and must alwayes be visible: For thus to be Invisible, is as much as not to be at all. For seeing the Parts of which it consists (be they but two or three persons in the most rigorous sense) are Visible, the whole must needs be visible too, of it self: however it may in the more  
received

received sense be termed invisible, because compared with the Church of Christ, as prophesied of, and promised in the Gospel, it is so inconsiderable, as may deserve rather to be accounted invisible, it being out-shined, and over-shadowed by other Pretenders.

But there being two things which constitute the Church; one, the association of many persons into outward communion one with another: the other the inward communion in the true Faith of Christ: and the former being common very often to Hereticks, as well as true Christians, it may be doubted, whether the true Church of Christ, as opposed to heretical Societies is at all visible? For seeing the true and orthodox Faith, together with its practical holiness, do not occur plainly to our senses, the true Faith cannot be discerned visibly from the false, by any outward sense: How can it possibly be said, that the Church of Christ is at all visible or apparent to a man? 'Tis true, a man may discern a real man from a painted man, or from any other creature from the outward notices of his body, though he cannot see his soul, which doth primarily constitute the person of man; but he cannot see whether he be a true and honest man in a moral sense, from any thing appearing outwardly. So may one discern the Faith professed in general to be Christian, by the outward frame and fashion of the Church professing the same: but the soundness of the same, and sincerity according to Christs will and institution, he cannot from thence conclude upon. And therefore, if the Catholick Faith, as Catholick (in the stricter sense) can never be visible; the Catholick Church so being and denominated from that Faith, can never be said to be properly visible, but only as a Society, not as the true Society of Christians in opposition to the false. For instance, sense or common reason not informed from the word of God, could never judge whether the *Arrian* or the Catholick Faith (as it then began to be called) were most truly Christian: but they both might judge that they were Christian Societies, and so at least outwardly, made a true Church. But because it is one thing to profess the true Faith; and another quite distinct from that, Truly to profess the Faith, as it is one thing to profess Justice and Truth and Honesty, and another truly to profess these and practise them, therefore can there be no estimate taken of the true Catholick Church from the persons professing the Catholick Faith, who are alwayes uncertain and mutable, but judgement must be made from the outward constitution only, which are Discipline or Government, and not Doctrine or Faith. For where the former is not rightly composed according to the mind and institution of Christ, there cannot be said to be a true Church. And where the second is wanting, there must likewise be no Church, the foundation of the Church and Rule failing; *viz.* the true Faith. But wherever these be inviolately and incorruptly preserved, and publickly professed, though we should suppose every particular Member of such a Society to be notorious Hypocrites, yet the Church might be said to be a true Church: because the Church doth not receive any more than its material subsistence from the persons believing: but its formal and more distinct Being it hath from the true Regiment and Faith, which it is possible, though scarce probable, may be sufficiently preserved under hypocritical and wicked members of the same. This is not only true



in it self, but appears so to be from the necessity of having any knowledge of the true Church at all; and its being visible at any time. For it never being certainly visible who are the predestinate infallibly to Life, and who are not; who shall constantly stand, and who shall fall; who are inwardly hypocrites, and who are faithful and sincere indeed (seeing notwithstanding the exactest judgment and search of man, there may be a falling away:) It could never appear which is the true Church, if judgment were to be made not from the outward Forms and Faith professed, but from the affection and inclination of Persons: or from the invisible decrees of God, of granting or denying persevering Grace to persons in the Church. So that it is manifest from hence, how furious, frivolous, vain, and sophistical disquisitions must needs be, which are founded and managed upon the ground of an invisible Church properly so called.

The improper acceptation then of *Invisible* can only occasion a just controverſie: *i. e.* as it is taken comparatively, and in relation to a much more conspicuous and glorious Society; and that either of Infidels who may by numbers much exceed in outward glory much outshine it, in power over-rule it; and by persecution and oppression so far straiten, lessen, and crush it, that it may be termed obscure and invisible. } Or otherwise compared with the Societies of much more publick and outwardly glorious Hereticks and Schismatics, pretending the Catholick Church.

And truly, if acute and exact Geographers computing the several professions of Religion, and their possessions of the earth, deceive us not, the Church of Christ may comparatively with other superstitions Mahometan, Jewish and Gentile, be not unaptly said to be invisible: Christian Religion being allowed but Five parts of Thirty, Mahometan six, and Idolaters nineteen parts of the earth. But if we shall divide Christian again into Catholick, according to the Judgment of several Writers, there will not remain at present above two parts of all the Thirty parts of the earth to be possessed by the Catholicks: and if so, what will become of the visibility of the Church, thus understood? And if a moderate sense of visibility be admitted, signifying a real and apparent being only of the Church, though inferiour in pomp and number unto others, how doth the great end and benefit for which chiefly the Church is to be maintained Catholick and Visible, shrink up into little or nothing, when it cannot commend it self, for any such glory to the beholder, nor signalize it self to the doubter of the true Faith in the Church? as may hereafter appear more fully when we shall come to speak of the Notes of the Church: It may suffice to conclude this Point with these two:

First, That Christs Church is essentially, and so long as it is at all, must necessarily be a Society or a communion of many. For so we are taught to believe out of the Apostles Creed: which speaking of the Catholick Church, exegetically interpreteth what we are to understand by that term: *viz. The Communion of Saints.* And therefore we are to distinguish between being of the [Catholick] Church, and being Christians. A man may be a Christian, and yet not be of the Church: For no man can be of the Church who doth not hold communion with it. For to deceive himself, and say, though he be not of the visible Communion or visible Church, he may be,  
or

or is of the invisible and mystical, is to take for granted that which he ought to prove, but never can be able, but from somewhat external; and the ordinary method and most effectual means of being mystically united unto Christ, is by being Politically united (which must be visibly) unto the Body of Christ, the Church. It hath been therefore ever matter of greatest wonder to me, to hear, and read how freely all struglers and Factions of Christians (how inconsiderable soever) do assert to, and confidently to assert that common Rule, *Without the Church there is no salvation*, and are so obscure, nice or absurd in their sense of it: having very little or nothing to secure themselves from self-condemnation, besides an ill grounded presumption that they are inwardly united to Christ, and are of the invisible Church; which in truth is no Church: but a certain state wherein there is no administration or order, that we can learn: now all Society must necessarily have order and administrations for their regulating: but none such do we read of to be in Christs invisible Body, Christ himself being all in all; and therefore improperly called a Church. And therefore all such being infallibly saved who are so of Christs Body: they that so abruptly and peremptorily assure themselves they are of that invisible State, do in effect contradict themselves, and mean they shall be saved without being of the Church: For surely the Authour of that saying meant nothing else, but that before one could be (according to Gods ordinary dispensation revealed in his word) of Christs mystical Body, called abusively the *Invisible Church*, he must belong to the visible communion of Christs Political Body or Church. So that it is not sufficient to comfort our selves with an opinion that we are good Christians, and hold the same Faith entirely and purely, that is required of us, unless we hold outward communion.

And therefore, secondly, as Christs Church must necessarily be a Society communicating, so must it be a visible communion, and outward. For how is it possible that such communion which constitutes a Society, should be entered into, unless it be visible? There shall therefore, as well out of the very nature of the Design God and Christ had to establish a Church, as from the many promises fortifying that Resolution, and perfecting that Design, be evermore an outward visible company of Professours of Christian Religion in the world, which shall retain the Faith of Christ, and the necessary effects of it in Worship, to that degree of perfection, which shall, or may lead a Believer certainly to Salvation, as will more plainly appear from what is now to succeed; viz. the outward Form of the Church.

## CHAP. XXVIII.

*Of the Outward and Visible Form of Christs Church: Christ ordained One particularly. What that was in the Apostles dayes, and immediately after. The vanity of such places of Scripture as are pretended against the Paternal Government of the Church.*

**F**OR the Church to be, and to be visible, or appear to be, I reckon the same thing: and therefore thought good to speak of that, and premise it to what in order follows on this subject: viz. The Visible Form. 2. The Adjuncts or Affections: And 3. the Power of the Church of Christ. By the Form of the Church we mean that frame and outward constitution, whereby the Society of Christian believers are not only united mystically and inwardly to Christ, as their proper Head, and universal, nor as agreeing in the substance of one Faith and Worship, but as convening and consenting in one outward Discipline, or Administration of this Body to be collected. So that Discipline, otherwise called Government, is, by principal Secretaries themselves, rightly affirmed to be an essential ingredient into the nature of a Church: which will manifestly appear if we distinguish between the nature of a Christian, or many Christians separate in themselves from any Jurisdiction; and the nature of a Church. For a Christian, or a true Believer, differeth from a Church in two things principally. First in the matter. The material part of a Believer, as he is a Christian, (not as he is a man) is his Faith, consisting of its several Articles and Branches. But the matter of the Church is the Christians themselves, whereof it consisteth. Secondly, they differ in their Form too: For no man is properly a Christian, though he believes all the Articles of a Christian, and lives accordingly. unless he be formed and fashioned by the Sacrament of Regeneration, which is Baptism. But the Form of Christs Church doth consist in that outward disposition and order of Superiour and Inferiour communicating mutually in all Christian Acts and Offices necessary to the conservation of the whole Body; and the edification and encrease of every Member thereof. This Description of Christs Church is warranted us from St. Paul to the Ephesians: who expressly maketh \* Christ the Head of his Church. From whom the whole Body fitly joyned together and compacted, by that which every joyned supplyeth, according to the effectual working in the measure of every Part, maketh increase of the Body, unto the edifying its self in Love. The like words to which we find to the Colossians, chap. 2. 19.

It must therefore from hence be granted, That there is to be Government in Christs Church: and that the Government ought to be proportionable

*Formale autem  
Ecclesie Ca-  
tholica est pro-  
fessio dei  
Christi integra  
sub suis Legiti-  
mis Rectoribus  
et Christo  
instituta mini-  
stris, cum Sa-  
cramentorum  
obsignatione,  
et participati-  
one, &c. Mar-  
cus Anton.  
Spalat. Lib. 7.  
cap. 10. §. 26.  
\* Eph. 4. 15, 16.  
Colof. 2. 19.*



tionable to the Body thereby ordered and ruled. To the Internal Body of Christ, or Mystical Church not visible to us, an Internal, Mystical, and Invisible administration, is very agreeable and sufficient from Christ the Head, and by the influence of the Holy Spirit: but the external Church standeth in need necessarily of external Rule and Direction, as much as it doth of external Doctrine, Instructions and Sacraments, though it be inwardly informed by the Spirit of Christ.

Now if it be enquired what that Government is whereby Christ would have his Church directed, (which is the most famous Question of late dayes, though scarce ever call'd in question for some hundred years after Christ) the resolution will be facilitated from what we delivered concerning Government civil. For first, if Government Ecclesiastical be so essential to the subsistence of a Church, that without it, it cannot be of any continuance, without a Miracle; it cannot be imagined with any probability of Reason, that God or Christ should make one part of his Church; and leave it to the liberty and pleasure of Man to make the other: but least of all can they be of this opinion, who think so sacredly of all Ecclesiastical Orders, that to admit any of humane invention or prudence, is to prophane the whole System. Again, upon the grounds laid down in civil Government: If Christ be the Author of Government Ecclesiastical in General, he must also be the Cause of some one Government in Particular, otherwise he could not be the Authour of any at all: seeing Institution Political, as well as Creation Natural, must of necessity have some Object to terminate it, as its effect: Generals, in all cases following Particulars, in the things themselves: though the way of knowledge, or learning these things, is to begin with the General, and so to descend to Particulars.

Thirdly, to understand what kind of Government Christ instituted in his Church, what more certain and compendious way, what more equal, than to judge rather from matter of Fact, than long and uncertain Disputations built on Arguments which are subject to diverse casualties from mans Passion, and Interests profecated thereby: whereas there is evidence sufficient from the thing it self, to settle belief in that Point.

Fourthly, we are here to note, That when we speak of Government, we intend not to comprehend therein all Accruments, Ornaments or Additions, which happened after the thing it self: For these may be, and doubtless oftentimes have been the effects of humane Prudence, regulated by general Precepts: but we speak of the Form it self, or the Kind of Government: For though we said, God was the Author of All well grounded Government, and do not mean, that every particle thereof, or inferiour, additional Grace must proceed from the same hand: For God having permitted, if not ordered, that every nation should conform it self in outward matters, to the condition of the time and place; God must have made for several Ages and several Places, several Regiments, which no man hath presumed to affirm; the Divine Right or Institution extending only to those things, wherein all at first agreed. So that as children receive from the Nature of man, at first created by God in Adam, their souls and bodily shape, with the several parts necessarily thereunto belonging; But their behaviours, gestures, gait, favour and complexions are commonly derived from their immediate Parents. So both every true Body of Christ, every Church, receive common forms

and shapes from the first Institution of Christ extant in the Primitive times, but their particular modifications and customs are owing to to their Spiritual Fathers, whether mediate or immediate. Which frowardly and peevishly to reject, or disobediently to oppose, without higher warrant, what is it else but to imitate such graceless and unnatural children who are ashamed of their own Parents?

Fifthly, A distinction ought to be put between the nature and degrees of any thing, and especially of the Church; which had its conception in the womb of the Jewish Church; its infancy, during our blessed Saviours abode upon the earth; its minority, during the Apostolical Age of One hundred years; its perfect state, soon after the first Christian Emperours advanced it, and augmented it with secular strength and glory: And it is certain, that as the *Roman* Empire became more corrupt and declined, so Christs Empire degenerated in many things, contracting deformities in Doctrine and Discipline, even from secular advantages granted unto it by the Devotion and Bounty of the best Wishers to it. We are not then to be so narrow in our judgment of the Churches state, to allow no more to it then when it but just crept out of the womb, or when, having gathered a little strength, it could stand alone, but not act according to the prime Institutours intention; but as it was habited and affected in its riper years, when we may behold that in more conspicuous manner, which at first was obscurer, yet essentially the same.

For as nothing is more evident to all, but such as resolve they will understand nothing that they dislike, than that, in nature, the Father is made before the children, and not the children before the Parents; so is it as plain, according to the course of Christs Church, and the history of the Scriptures, that the people at the first did no more make or appoint their Government, or Governours in Christ, than they did teach or instruct them: For by the word of God were Christians at first begotten to a new and spiritual life.

The method which Christ used in procreating and prosecuting his Church, is therefore thus made plain: First he himself, as the Father and Head of us all under God immediately, (according to that of St. Paul, *The Head of every man is Christ, and the head of the woman is the man, and the Head of Christ is God*) did by his divine Doctrine and Miracles beget unto himself his twelve Apostles, his children: these being first consummated by Christ unto a capacity of Fathers also, and enabled to multiply into spiritual children of Grace; when Christ ceased visibly and politically (for he never ceases spiritually) to assist and direct his Church, were by him, as so many Princes of his Ecclesiastical Monarchy, commissioned and authorized to dilate the same, and amplify it, according to the Power, Prescriptions, and Grace given them to that end. And Christ foreseeing his Kingdom to be of that vast extent, that it would surpass the strength and ability of any one man to administer the whole, did not leave any Delegate so plenarily endued with Power Ecclesiastical, as that all should derive from him, as they did from himself: For then it had appeared by some Act of Christ, and some instance in them, in their receiving subordinate power from that eminent Person, during his abode on earth, which could have been no more derogative from Christ, than it is thought to be now by any. But the Twelve were alike called by Christ immediately, and not the least intimation of any pre-eminence, unless in order, which cannot be avoided, where there is found never so great and just equality.

Now

*Tum maxime  
Deus ex memo-  
ria hominum  
labitur, cum  
beneficiis ejus  
fruentes hono-  
rem dare divi-  
ne indulgentie  
deberent. La-  
ctantius lib. 2.  
cap. 1. de Ori-  
gine Erroris.  
Hv εἰς πῶς  
διωμοῖς καὶ  
ταῖς διὰ τῶν  
συνελεξαμένων  
ἡδὲ καὶ διὰ τῶν  
αὐτῶν ἐν τῇ  
ἐκκλησίᾳ ὡς  
καὶ ταῖς αὐτοῖς.  
Nazienz. O.  
rat. 1. contra  
Julianum.*

*1 Cor. 4. 15.  
Philem. 10.*

*1 Cor. 11. 3.  
Ephes. 5. 23.*

Now because they were rather in habitude and Right, than Act, Rulers and Fathers of the Church, and the whole Earth was to be their Diocess, therefore it behoved and was most just that they should set in Common-council together touching the general design of reducing the whole World to the knowledge and obedience of Christ: as we read they did in the Second of the *Acts*, and in the Fifteenth, and elsewhere. But being enjoined to depart from *Jerusalem*, and every one to betake himself to such peculiar Quarters of the World as fell to them by Gods Providence and Assignment, it was no longer so absolutely necessary to hold assemblies for the special management of each ones proper Cure, but full power resided in every Apostle of Christ, and accordingly was by them exerted, to ordain matters necessary to the Flock collected by them. So that notwithstanding what was of publick concernment to the whole, fell under the cognizance of all the Apostles, as Peers of Christs Kingdom, yet were limited Districts or Diocesses disposed of by the council and authority of one presiding there. And if there were called more to consult of that portion of the Church, it was rather of humane reason, than divine Institution. For it was ever far from Gods intention in appointing extraordinary Methods and Rules for his Church, utterly to extinguish or evacuate humane Reason: which his own hand had planted in mans soul before; but it was to be subject to the Superiour Law given by him, and where that which was never intended to be of that unnecessary and immense latitude as to take in all contingencies, prescribed not otherwise, Gods will, we may be sure it was, that that other help of reason should not be denied its office, and right of ministering to our uses. And what is more agreeable to reason, then, That *in the multitude of counsels there is safety*, (many being able to discern more than one alone, and more willing and ready to execute when their head in determining goeth before their hand in executing: And on the other side, That *For the transgression of a Land many are the Princes thereof*. Nature it self teacheth us that many Counsellors and few Commanders is the most rational and secure course to prevent discords and confusions.

Prov. 11. 14.

Prov. 28. 2.

But I am far from disputing or arguing this Question any farther than the ground I have laid already will allow, and that is only, to enquire after matter of Fact in the Government of Christs Church; thinking it most reasonable and pious to conclude that to be the only Divine which Christ instituted, and that Christ only instituted that, which only appeared in the World at his being upon earth, and his Apostles after him: who, though they brought not Ecclesiastical Government to that visible Form and Order as it afterwards shewed it self in, to the world; increasing with the number, and magnificence of professours of Christ; yet gave the Idea and Patern in all the main substantial parts of it. For, *as the Father hath sent me, even so send I you*, saith Christ, Christ saith not to any one of his Disciples, *So send I thee*: for then it might have been understood so as if he had endowed some single person with such a plenitude of power, whereby he might succeed him in presiding over all his other Disciples, and consequently over the universal Church: but *so send I you*: signifying the imparting of his absolute and entire power unto all his Apostles, so far as might consist with the co-ordination founded amongst them, and conduce to the benefit of the future Church. Between Christ then and his Apostles, there was a likeness, but no parity or equality of power: Between the Apostles themselves, there was

John 20. 21.

an



an equality: But upon the raising of a Church, and multiplying of Christians immediately sprang up discrimination of Persons and Officers in the Body of the Church. Neither can any argue from the Parity of Christs Apostles, that there ought to be a Parity also among all that succeed in the Ministerial Office, any more than, that this Parity should extend it self to the whole Body of the Church: For so it was with the Church first of all; not only all the Ministers, but Members were equal.

And whether it were simple necessity, or humane prudence, or divine Inspiration, that first moved the Apostles to limit that General Right, which Christ had given them indefinitely to Go and teach all Nations; and each of them to be universal Pastours, in assuming to themselves the special care and tuition of some one place, Province, or Country, it matters not much to enquire. For the supposition which some make of an Obligation upon every Apostle to keep himself so strictly unto the commission of Christ, empowering him to minister to all Nations, that it was not lawful for him, of himself, nor by general and mutual counsel and consent amongst themselves, to be determined to any one Province or Nation, is very groundless and injurious to the whole design Christ had in propagating the Faith. For the said commission of Christ given to his Apostles was not *Lex* but *Jus*: a Right to Act, not a *Precept* indispensably enjoying the execution according to the full extent of the Letter. Again, It was not said to each singly, *Go and teach all nations*: but to all conjoynly. So that to all it was a direct Precept which was fulfilled, if all Nations were by all the Apostles, not all by each of them instructed in Christ. But the interpretation which takes *All nations* to be rather understood negatively in opposition to the Jewish Church, which enviously denied the like Priviledges of salvation to the Gentiles which they claimed proper to themselves, rather then positively, as if by virtue of Christs injunction they were necessitated to pass all the world over, (which it is certain that neither any one, nor all ever did; the intention of Christ being to open a wide door of Grace to all Nations, so far as humane ability could ordinarily promote the work) quite disables that argument. As it was lawful therefore for all the Apostles, and every one of them, to pass into any Part of the world, so was it not unlawful to make choise of some one considerable portion, wherein to move and officiate according to his Place. For otherwise, how should it be lawful for them to continue in some one City two, three, or seven years, as 'tis as certain, as any thing in History can be, that some of them did, taking a peculiar and pastoral care thereof, and its Appendages?

Now, because as their Presence was finite in reference to place, so their lives were to time; therefore, when in any one large Province they could not manage immediately themselves, every City of note and command, they assigned certain Substitutes to continue and promote what they had begun, even during their lives, in many Countries: And departing this life, left them to succeed in a perpetual line to all ages; not by intrusion and spontaneous invasion possessing themselves of Rule and Authority over others, but according to the same form that themselves were sent by Christ. For Christ not only sent his Apostles, but enabled them to send others in the like Pastoral charge. And these Apostolical Pastours, together with that personal Power given them to be exercised by them, had also a real paternal Power to constitute others of the like, or  
inferiour

inferiour order, as necessary emergencies required, upon the increase of the Professours of Christian Religion, as may in due place be more clearly proved.

From hence a reason may be rendred of the Opinion of some very sober and learned Defenders of Episcopal Government, who seeing neither the Apostles alone to govern the Church, nor Bishops alone, have said, It is very hard to determine what was the Discipline of the Church in the very Primitive times of all. For surely, while the Apostles lived, the Government of the Church was Apostolical, and not properly Episcopal; because those Elders (otherwise called Bishops) said in Scripture to be set over Cities, were themselves wholly at the beck and disposal of the Apostles ordaining them, and governed and taught under them: no otherwise than a Priest may be under a Bishop in all subjection. But the Apostles dying, and their intire power also with them, part of it devolved unto that Person, who before in their Right presided over such a Church, (the Apostolicallness excepted which consisted in an immediate Ordination to that Office by Christ, and illimitedness, as to the exercise thereof; with other signal gifts and graces, not here to be insisted on) and was properly Episcopal: which consisted in an Authority derived from the Apostles, and consequently from Christ, to govern the Church; and not only present, for their dayes; but because it was to continue to all Ages, (which it could not without Governours and Teachers) to ordain such who should ordain others without interruption) for ever: And these not only such who should succeed them in the like Pastoral care, but who might together with them (though under them) by their counsel and labours, as the common Fathers of the Church, take part of his charge upon them, in teaching and governing such a portion of that Church as was allotted them. And these were called Priests or Presbyters. And as the Bishop was constrained, Christians multiplying, to ordain an assistant Presbyter to him, so when the People under that Presbyter increased so far that it was too difficult for him to discharge all Offices of publick and private ministration, it was found expedient to ordain an inferiour Officer in the Church, to him, for his assistance, called a Deacon or Minister. Not that these two last Orders themselves were of humane or modern Institution than the Apostles dayes, but that they might be likewise undetermined, in the place of their Function, to any particular Person, until the consummation of the Apostolical age: But in truth, it is hard to determine what the Scripture intends speaking of Deacons; and therefore, I offer this mean opinion, as not inconsistent with theirs, who hold them of Apostolical Institution; nor with theirs, who make them much later: For the first may be true, as to the Office which was a degree Ecclesiastical, as *St. Paul* intimateth: and the other, as to the manner of exercise, in reference to one place, and one presiding there.

And the like seems most probable concerning the Evangelists, who were persons commissioned by the Apostles to preach the Gospel under them, without any determination to a certain place or people; and saving this large Licence, were in no higher degree than simple Presbyters: the Apostles themselves presiding in all such places, as Pastours: But when they were by their farther Authority fixt to one City and Country, with a power to create Successours or Co-adjutors in the Government of that Church, then they became formal and proper Bishops. For the alle-

gation of them is most frivolous, who would elude the expresse testimonies of Scripture, affirming that *Timothy* and *Titus* were Bishops, by saying they were *Evangelists*: For by the same reason they may deny they were Presbyters, because probably they were Evangelists, and so make them of no order in the Church, or of another, which is yet unknown to the world: which, whatever it may please men to call it, certainly it must be founded on Priestly Power, or else they could not have regularly acted as they did. Neither was it, as some may phantasie, to degrade such Evangelists whose faculty extended to all places, to be confined to one afterward, as Bishop. First, because such power was more truly indetermined to one, than extending actually to all: For it depended on the pleasure of the Apostles to send them to what place they thought fit: Secondly, this fixing of them to one place was not without the accession of power of Government, as well as preaching, which is no where found to be in them before; and which doth more than countervail such antecedent liberty of simply teaching, as was then in some manner fixed. Thirdly, there was in such cases as this, added a Power and Right of instituting others as occasion offered, which is unknown to have been in them as Evangelists.

From it follows that of all the forementioned kinds of Government; that of the Church approached neereſt to that call'd Monarchical, which was only absolute and universal in Christ, the Sovereign Head thereof; but Ministerially under him, and over the Church under their circuit Politically, as proper Heads and Rulers: and whatever power (after extraordinary Callings by Revelation from God ceased) any one dispartake of in the Church, was certainly at first derived from such single Persons alone, however to the solemnity of such ordination others of an inferior Order concurred thereto. And as the Government of the civil World was originally without exception, so far as search can be made by the most curious Antiquaries, Monarchical, though it were not governed by one man alone, but by Civil Supream Princes of several Dominions, into which the earth was parcelled. So though no one Father or Bishop ever presided over all the Christian world, yet several single Persons in their respective Provinces governing the Church as Principal, the Government of the Church may rightly be termed Monarchical in Particular; but Aristocratical as to the whole: For as the Apostles were all Monarchs compared with their Proselytes, Converts, and Churches by them founded, but were but Peers compared one with another: So was it with the Bishops and Patriarchs of the Church succeeding them; whereby the Propheſie of Christ in St. *Matthew* was verified, spoken not so much (as some mistake it) of his Heavenly Kingdome, but earthly, his Church and its ensuing glory. *Verily I say unto you, that ye which have followed me in the regeneration, when the Son of man shall sit in the throne of his glory, ye also shall sit upon twelve thrones judging the twelve Tribes of Israel.* That when the Church of Christ should flourish, then there should be such as, in lieu of the twelve Tribes of *Israel*, should Rule as in Thrones, the Church of God under the Gospel.

Matth. 19. 28.

Matth. 20, 25, 26.

They who object against this the words of Christ in Saint *Matthew*, *Ye know that the Princes of the Gentiles exercise dominion over them, and they that are great exercise authority upon them: But it shall not be so among you.* Do declare no less against Aristocratical than Monarchical Government,



Government, yea all Government over the Church. And their favourable glosses in behalf of one, will be as valid for that which they reject. For as it was not at all the mind of Christ that there should be no Governours at all over his Church; so doth it not at all appear that what was lawful for many to do, was not lawful for one. But here the old cheat again takes place to suppose that the Government of one is in it self tyrannical, and of many, free: but neither Christ nor nature ever taught them how to prove this presumptuous imagination. And to this may we add another such mistake from St. *Peters* words, That men should not be Lords over Gods heritage. And what then? Must there be more than one over a Church, and not onely one? May a company of Presbyters oblige Christians to do, or believe such things; and not Lord it, but, if by a principal Person bearing Rule, this same thing be done, then is the Precept violated? Besides, who sees not, that hath not a mind to be blind, That the Apostle speaks nothing at all in these words of the kind of Government, but the exercise of it, and abuse? Surely if Episcopal Government could not choose but tyrannize, and Presbyterial could do nothing but according to Scripture and equity; this Objection were unanswerable, otherwise not worth the mentioning, much less answering, as common as it is, and as confidently urged.

1 Pet. 5. 3.

And as to that Pretense intended to overthrow our prime ground of Christs institution taken from what was first actually found in the Church: viz. That Imparity of Christs Ministers was not found in the Church till about an hundred and forty or fifty years after Christ (when it is confessed by the Enemies of Ecclesiastical Hierarchies, that it prevailed.) Let the Huggers of this Device, First consider what a pitiful addition is made to their cause from hence; seeing that, it is undeniable there was a disparity all the Apostles dayes, who in order excelled all Ecclesiastical Persons; and that almost one hundred years were spent of the said term, in their time: So that about fifty or sixty years only this imaginary Government had its being, and then was lost again for fourteen hundred, and then was better lost then found, and taken up again. But a far worse inconvenience spoils this jest, as being founded and raised only from conjecture; and that conjecture upon the obscurity of those ages, not so clearly known as afterwards.

gation of them is most frivolous, who would elude the exprefs testimonies of Scripture, affirming that *Timothy* and *Titus* were Bishops, by saying *they were Evangelists*: For by the same reason they may deny they were Presbyters, because probably they were Evangelists, and so make them of no order in the Church, or of another, which is yet unknown to the world: which, whatever it may please men to call it, certainly it must be founded on Priestly Power, or else they could not have regularly acted as they did. Neither was it, as some may phansie, to degrade such Evangelists whose faculty extended to all places, to be confined to one afterward, as Bishop. First, because such power was more truly indetermined to one, than extending actually to all: For it depended on the pleasure of the Apostles to send them to what place they thought fit: Secondly, this fixing of them to one place was not without the accession of power of Government, as well as preaching, which is no where found to be in them before; and which doth more than countervail such antecedent liberty of simply teaching, as was then in some manner fixed. Thirdly, there was in such cases as this, added a Power and Right of instituting others as occasion offered, which is unknown to have been in them as Evangelists.

From it follows that of all the forementioned kinds of Government; that of the Church approached neereſt to that call'd Monarchical, which was only absolute and universal in Christ, the Sovereign Head thereof; but Ministerially under him, and over the Church under their circuit Politically, as proper Heads and Rulers: and whatever power (after extraordinary Callings by Revelation from God ceased) any one diſpartake of, in the Church, was certainly at first derived from such single Persons alone, however to the solemnity of such ordination others of an inferior Order concurred thereto. And as the Government of the civil World was originally without exception, so far as search can be made by the most curious Antiquaries, Monarchical, though it were not governed by one man alone, but by Civil Supream Princes of several Dominions, into which the earth was parcelled. So though no one Father or Bishop ever presided over all the Christian world, yet several single Persons in their respective Provinces governing the Church as Principal, the Government of the Church may rightly be termed Monarchical in Particular; but Aristocratical as to the whole: For as the Apostles were all Monarchs compared with their Profelites, Converts, and Churches by them founded, but were but Peers compared one with another: So was it with the Bishops and Patriarchs of the Church succeeding them: whereby the Propheſie of Christ in St. *Matthew* was verified, spoken not so much (as some mistake it) of his Heavenly Kingdome, but earthly, his Church and its ensuing glory. *Verily I say unto you, that ye which have followed me in the regeneration, when the son of man shall sit in the throne of his glory, ye also shall sit upon twelve thrones judging the twelve Tribes of Israel.* That when the Church of Christ should flourish, then there should be such as, in lieu of the twelve Tribes of *Israel*, should Rule as in Thrones, the Church of God under the Gospel.

Matth. 19. 28.

Matth. 20, 25, 26.

They who object against this the words of Christ in Saint *Matthew*, *Ye know that the Princes of the Gentiles exercise dominion over them, and they that are great exercise authority upon them: But it shall not be so among you.* Do declare no less against Aristocratical than Monarchical Government,

Government, yea all Government over the Church. And their favourable gloss in behalf of one, will be as valid for that which they reject. For as it was not at all the mind of Christ that there should be no Governours at all over his Church; so doth it not at all appear that what was lawful for many to do, was not lawful for one. But here the old cheat again takes place to suppose that the Government of one is in it self tyrannical, and of many, free: but neither Christ nor nature ever taught them how to prove this presumptuous imagination. And to this may we add another such mistake from St. *Peters* words, That men should not be *Lords over Gods heritage*. And what then? Must there be more than one over a Church, and not onely one? May a company of Presbyters oblige Christians to do, or believe such things; and not *Lord* it, but if by a principal Person bearing Rule, this same thing be done, then is the Precept violated? Besides, who sees not, that hath not a mind to be blind, That the Apostle speaks nothing at all in these words of the kind of Government, but the exercise of it, and abuse? Surely if Episcopal Government could not choose but tyrannize, and Presbyterial could do nothing but according to Scripture and equity; this Objection were unanswerable, otherwise not worth the mentioning, much less answering, as common as it is, and as confidently urged.

1 Pet. 5. 3.

And as to that Pretense intended to overthrow our prime ground of Christs institution taken from what was first actually found in the Church: *viz.* That Imparity of Christs Ministers was not found in the Church till about an hundred and forty or fifty years after Christ (when it is confessed by the Enemies of Ecclesiastical Hierarchies, that it prevailed.) Let the Huggers of this Device, First consider what a pitiful addition is made to their cause from hence; seeing that it is undeniable there was a disparity all the Apostles dayes, who in order excelled all Ecclesiastical Persons; and that almost one hundred years were spent of the said tearm, in their time: So that about fifty or sixty years only this imaginary Government had its being, and then was lost again for fourteen hundred, and then was better lost then found, and taken up again. But a far worse inconvenience spoils this jest, as being founded and raised only from conjecture; and that conjecture upon the obscurity of those ages, not so clearly known as afterwards.



## C H A P. XXIX.

*Of the necessity of holding visible Communion with Christs Church. Knowledge of that visible Church necessary to that Communion. Of the Notes to discern the true Church: how far necessary. Of the Nature or Condition of such Notes in General.*

**I**T being so necessary (as we have above shewed) to be in communion with the visible Church of Christ, and the Natures of things themselves being more intrinsick, many times, than to characterize sufficiently them to the Enquirer into them; it hath been thought necessary to explain them farther by more apparent and observable notices given of them. And in the Doctrine of the Church these seem to be of greatest consequence; *Visibility, Universality or Catholickness, Sanctity and Perpetuity.* Of all which we shall briefly speak in order: yet first premising somewhat concerning Notes in General.

For seeing (as we have said) it is necessary to know the true Church from the false, and the Natures of things are often-times so abstruse and hidden from us that we cannot discover them from their own Light, therefore it hath been judged very reasonable to pitch upon certain outward Notes, leading us unerringly to the knowledge of the thing it self. And in truth, I cannot wholly approve of that course chosen to certify us, and point out to us the true Church, taken from the very being of it: such as are, *Faithful and sincere Doctrine taught therein, Sacraments duly administered, Worship purely performed, and Discipline rightly constituted:* because these are rather of the very intrinsick nature, and definition it self of the Church, than notes and characters outward, whereby the nature it self should be certainly known. We all, indeed without exception, consent that that Church is the true Church, which is thus qualified and affected; believeth aright, is governed aright, administred the Sacraments aright, and worshippeth aright; and in one word, which followeth most exactly the Rules of Holy Scripture; but in the Assumption and Application is all the doubt, and infinite differences; which of all Pretenders to these, are assuredly so affected, and blessed most with them. Therefore, these are not sufficient lights and demonstration of themselves to us. For we grant readily, That whatever Church hath all them, is without controversy a true Church of Christ; but whether this or that Church pretending to them, hath them really, remains to be enquired into. Hence it hath been judged expedient to repair to some more sensible and apparent Notes or Indications to certify us of matter of Fact; *viz.* that so it is with this Church, and not with another. And it is well said, That Notes of a thing must necessarily be distinct from the thing they

they notifie unto us: and that especially in these two things. First, in reference to the thing described, than which they must be more evident and apparent: as the argument must alwayes be more clear than the thing in Question to be proved therewith. Secondly, in reference to other things, they must not be common to more than that thing they are used to express and signifie: As no man that never saw an horse before, can know it from an Ox, by being told that, an Horse hath two ears, four legs, and a long tail. And a third note of a true Note may be added, and that is, that it be *inseparable*. For though no more but one thing has such a mark by which it may be known, yet if that thing be moveable, and not constant to it, it cannot at all times be known by it; as the Moon cannot alwayes be distinguished and known from other stars, from horns or Angles which many times it wants.

This speculation is very rational, but yet not exempt altogether from the inconveniencies of the former opinion, it failing little less in the Invention and Application of such unfailing Notes as are presumed and promised. For those being the very choicest of many more Notes mentioned by some for the guiding us to the true Catholick Church, they are either obscure, or inconstant and separable, or lastly common to those Churches not received for pure and Catholick, as will appear by and by: Therefore, I suppose, a mean opinion may in this case be most true and safe: as that, First, there can be no such infallible outward means of coming to, or discerning the true Church from the false, as may secure any one from error. For the Prophecies and Promises of Christ concerning the glory and conspicuousness of his Church; *viz.* that it should be *as a City set on a hill*: That it should be the *Light of the world*; That it should be *a Mountain unto which all Nations should flow*, and such like; infer no more than this, That, whereas under the Law the Doors of Christs Church were in a manner shut against the greatest part of the world; under the Gospel Christ would keep open house to all commers: and that it should be more possible and easie to enter into the communion of his true Flock, than formerly it had been; not that it should not be possible to mistake, but upon affected and wilful ignorance, next to malice. Neither doth there appear any greater reason, why any man should be infallible in the choice of the true Church, than when he is in the true Church, that he should be infallible in all points of Faith therein truly professed. In a word, No greater inconvenience doth appear from the want of infallible means to lead men to the true Church, who are in sight, but not knowledge of it; than to bring Heathens into an ordinary capacity of entring into it. A man may be damned in that corrupt and degenerate state he now is in, for want of that grace, he could not of himself acquire, and yet God be under no imputation of injustice or tyranny, who gives him no more than he deserves, and denies him no more than he may justly detain from him. For the mercy of God exceeds all, not only merit, but admiration that so many find the way to the truth; while some (as St. Paul hath it) are *Ever learning and never able to come to the knowledge of the truth.* <sup>2 Tim. 3. 7.</sup> But were it so, that those means to salvation, whether general or particular, did work naturally, not Evangelically or morally By the co-adjutancie of grace accompanying them, and inwardly disposing the mind to assent to, and embrace them, then indeed ought there to be certain and infallible causes outward to that end; but it is not so: for as liberal as

God

God hath shewn himself in the Gospel and means outward of attaining to the truth, he keeps the reins still in his own hands, and the key of knowledge by him, the efficacy of the most probable means, even that of distinguishing and knowing the true Church, depending upon his free and inscrutable Grace; which would in this particular be superfluous and useles, if certain access might be made unto it by demonstrative notes to that purpose.

A second thing commending herein a mean opinion, may be the due acknowledgment of the use of such outward marks and means guiding us to this prime truth of the Church. For notwithstanding, we have said the Grace of God hath a main stroke in every mans right choice of such dubious undemonstrable truths, yet doth it not ordinarily concurr (and we have nothing to know of extraordinary acts of God) but by such ordinary means as he hath instituted and tyed us to observe, to be capable thereof: and therefore are we to embrace and improve all outward helps which may best conduce to that end; otherwise we either forfeit or repel such grace from us. And of such means I know none more reasonable and probable to bring us to the knowledge of this point, then are they above mentioned.

Thirdly, the use of those means or notes upon tryal, will be found to consist not so much in the Affirmative, as Negative sense: that is, not characterizing Catholick Churches in opposition to Heretical, by being found only in any Church, because they are also found in such as are reputed Heretical: but being not found in Churches pretending Catholicisme, stigmatizing them for false and defective. And truly it is well worth the labour to be informed of errors, as that which prepareth to the knowledge of the truth.

Lastly, it is to be observed of the nature of Notes or Properties, that they are either of the whole *Species* or kind, as that given by *Plato* of a Man, That he is a *two-footed creature having no feathers on his body*: or they are Particular, relating to some *Individuum* or single one of that kind: as that given of God himself to distinguish *Saul* whom God had designed King, from the rest of the people, from his stature, That *he was higher by head and shoulders than the rest of the people*. And thus was *Elijah* the *Tishbite* known to *Amaziah*, That *he was an hairy man, girt with a girdle of Leather*. Now in this question it is not so much enquired into, how absolutely one man may be known from another; nor how one Church may be distinguished from another, as the *Roman* from the *Greek*, or the *English* from the *French* Church; for this, though it be very easie, is scarce worth the labour: but the doubt and material difficulty is, How to know which of these are Catholick and true Churches of Christ, and which are Heretical or Erroneous in any degree? I say, the Enquiry is not, which is which Church, as a man might be known to be such an one by name, from his stature, his hair or the like: but which of these are true and orthodox Churches. This can be by no other notes infallibly, but such as are truly and constantly proper to true Churches, and are no less found in other true Churches than in this. And therefore it is most true, what is commonly said, That the true Church is known by the true Faith professed, right Discipline administred, and the holy Sacraments duly used; but not before it be certainly known that all these are actually so observed, and really not pretendedly only. And so is it as true, That, it being known

1 Sam. 9.2.  
10. 24.

2 Kings 1. 8.



known certainly which is the true Church, it must be known likewise by necessary consequence, that all these three are faithfully observed in that Church; which could not be true without them. Now if we first must judge of Churches by the three General Instances and Indications, we must first judge of these Ingredients into its Nature: and before we can do so, must run through a whole body of Divinity, and that with fallible judgment in the search of it. On the other side, if we would know which is the true Religion, from the true Church; to know the true Church first, we must pass through infinite Disputes and Controversies, with the like uncertainty of judging aright as before: and in doing both these, we forsake the pretended method of judging by Notes, for we are hereby immers'd in the indagation of the thing it self, without consideration of Notes: which if they could be had apparently and infallibly, would prevent that long and tedious labour of examining the matter it self. But such (as I have said) I know none positive: the neereſt we can come to the point, is Negatively, when there is apparently wanting such things as declare at least the unsoundness and imperfection of the whole Body, so defective.

## CHAP. XXX.

### *Of the Notes of the true Church in Particular. Of Antiquity, Succession, Unity, Universality, Sanctity: How far they are Notes of the true Church.*

**T**HE four principal Notes of the true, or rather false Church, not found in it, are *Antiquity, Unity, Succession, Universality*: and as modern Controversers, in *England* especially, the name of *Catholick* it self.

To the first of these we say, That her *Antiquity* is not to be compared with things of quite another nature, but with things of the same nature, and comprehended in some eminent Period of time. For the Natural worship was more ancient than the Mosaical, and the Mosaical than the Christian, in such things wherein they differed. For we have before shown, That *Christian Religion*, according to the material and natural Part of it, which was that connatural light and reason shining cleerly in the heart of man, and directing him to the belief and worship of one God, exceeded in time the Jewish worship, yet was not to be preferred before it; and the like may be said of the Jewish and Christian. But the enquiry is chiefly about those of the same Oeconomy, the same profession and denomination. As if it should be demanded, which of the natural Religions were the truest? answer might well be made, That which was most ancient and agreeable to prime Institution. And in like manner, That must be the purest of the Jewish or Mosaical which agrees

grees most exactly with the most ancient and first instituted, of that kind: and so of the Christian undoubtedly; that which retained most of the divine Truths and Worship, ought to be preferred as the best of that kind; as is plain from the Prophet *Jeremiah*, advising that degenerate people and Church thus; *Stand ye in the wayes, and see, and ask for the old paths, where is the good way, and walk therein, and ye shall find rest for your souls.*— Nay, we may extend this to the Mahometan Religion thus far truly; viz. to be informed from antiquity, which of all the several Sects are most truly Mahometan, weighing their agreement to, or discrepantie from the Institutions of the first Author of that Superstition.

But here it will be necessary to distinguish between things agreeable to the institution, things instituted, and things contrary to institution; and that as well for our better satisfaction in the following notes, as this present: though I confess, all this is overthrown if that be taken for granted, which some mischievously would obtrude upon the Christian Church in these last dayes, That nothing, whether intrinsick or extrinsick to Religion it self, in the substance, must be instituted but by Christ, and such as were divinely inspired by him: But this at present I shall take for groundless, senseless, and unpracticable by the Assertours and Defenders of it; some other place being more proper for its confutation. But this diversity being allowed, as all reason requires, the resolution of this case will be much facilitated: For surely, that Church (have it never so many and fair advantages otherwise to commend it to the world) which shall either have lost any material Article of Christian Faith, or notably corrupted and perverted, or introduced any Tenet which is contrary to the first Institution, and for which no good ground or reason can be alledged out of the all-sufficient Rule of Faith, must needs be false: and that no such warrant can be there had, the total silence, or contrary Doctrine of the Ages next under the Date of Scriptures (which we here make the Rule) do prove. For where neither the Scriptures most ancient expresse, or necessarily infer any Doctrine of Faith; nor Tradition hath never so understood the Scriptures, there no greater evidence can be found upon earth to discern truth from falsehood, and consequently the Catholick and Apostolick Faith from the Spurious and Heretical. And from this head it was that we find the ancient Fathers to oppose and confute the Heretical Inventions and Innovations of men contrary to sound Faith. For supposing that Christ was the first founder and dispenser of Christian Doctrine, and that he delivered this to the Apostles to be farther propagated in the world; what could be said more effectually against perverters of the same, than to shew that such fond and impious tenets as Hereticks obtruded upon the world, could never have Christ for their Author, because those who immediately drew from that Fountain, never taught any such thing, but the contrary rather. And that they did not, they proved from instances in all the principal Sees of the Apostles, and their immediate and following Successors, who never delivered any such Doctrine to the world. Upon this Innovating Hereticks were forced to seek subterfuge from revelations, and extraordinary discoveries promised (as they corruptly understood Scripture) by Christ in St. *John*, saying; *I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now. Howbeit, when the Spirit of truth shall come he will guide you unto all truth, &c.* Hence they collected, That Christ communi-  
cated





Ephes. 4. 11, 12

Hebr. 7. 23.

John 10: 1.

For *Succession* another note of the Church; I find it by some, divided into Succession Doctrinal and Personal: meaning better than they speak. For I know nothing properly succeeding, but where something is departed or lost. Now the Doctrine of the Church being incessant and perpetual, and not diverse from it self, cannot be said properly to *succeed* it self, as to *persevere* in the Church. But if we should pass that order, and allow this language; yet the thing it self seems here quite to be mistaken: it being not at present enquired into the Faith of the Church (which if it were granted to be sound and Catholick, doth not of it self necessarily and fully infer a true Church: and upon the reasons before agreed to; *viz.* Due administration of Discipline to be essential to a true Church) but into the Form constituting it a Visible and Formal Church; to which is indispensably required proper Pastors, and that by the appointment of Christ, as St. Paul thus witnesseth speaking of Christ leaving the earth, and ascending into heaven, and deputing thereupon certain Officers in his stead, in a visible ministration, which he ceaseth now to exercise. *He gave some Apostles, and some Prophets, and some Evangelists, and some Pastors and Teachers; For the perfecting of the Saints, for the work of the Ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ.* Now it is not necessary here to determine the quarrel about the kind of Officers here mentioned, it sufficing to our purpose what is very evident, that they who are Governours of the Church, must be given to the Church by Christ. But Christ acting no longer politically or visibly (as hath been said and must be yielded) but mystically; he cannot be said to ordain any immediately in his own person, but by the ministry of others. Now how is it possible to distinguish them whom Christ hath appointed to constitute others in the Church, from them to whom he hath given no such order, but by this succession we now speak of, namely a tradition of that faculty which is in one deriving it originally, though by many intermediate hands, from Christ himself, to another succeeding him: because (as the Apostle to the Hebrews speaks) the *Priests are not suffered to continue by reason of Death.* This surrogation then of Pastors and Priests is not to be at the pleasure or arbitrement of men, to institute; but must be by the will of Christ: and this will of Christ must be revealed unto us either by the ordinary line and course from himself and Apostles, or else must by some extraordinary and miraculous way be made known to men. For though we deny it to be Christs practise to commission men to these ends, we do not deny it to be in his power so to do: but that he hath so done actually to the fairest Pretenders, we shall deny until better demonstrations than can be made from their own asseverations, or appealing to the extraordinary effects of their Ministry. Christ sayes in the Tenth of *John, Verily, verily— he that entreteth not by the door into the sheep-fold, but climbeth up some other way, the same is a thief and a robber.* That the Sheep-fold is the Church, that the door is the ordinary way of entering into office in that Church, that the Shepherd is Presider over the Church I find none to doubt; nor that climbing in at the windows is extraordinary thrusting ones self into Office in the Church; nor that such as do so, though they be never so conscionable, painful and orthodox otherwise, are not thieves and robbers, if not shearing & abusing the Flock, yet taking that upon them without ordinary grant, which belongs not to them. This evil is only remedied by a successive and ordinary transmission of that Power which Christ left, with certain peculiar persons he called, Apostles, with authority to communicate the same

same to others, to the worlds end ; according to the several ranks and orders of his Ministers, of which his Church consisteth. So that succession not of Doctrine only, but Officers in the Church, is no less essential to a Church properly so called, than Officers themselves or Discipline. And as for the distinction invented without any precedent in antiquity, without any warrant from Scripture, without any justice or reason humane or divine, to stop mens mouths, and blind their eyes who are very simple; of *Vocation internal and external*, it is utterly rejected as a vain, frivolous, impertinent phanſie. For internal Vocation, (as they called it) is nothing but an ability competently serving to such an end ; but this is no Vocation at all properly, any more than it is for me to take anothers purse, because God hath given me strength, power and opportunity to do so. It may be an exception will here be put in against the comparison from the unlawfulness of this latter, and not of the former : but I suppose as well an unlawfulness in the former, though not so notorious, as in the latter : And adde, That however, considered in it self, it be unlawful for me to spoil another, yet if God calls me to it, it is not ; and according to the new Doctrine of Vocation, a man is then inwardly called, when he is enabled to do a thing. But an Outward call too is commended, and that ordinary too, when things are settled to our mind, otherwise extraordinary calling must suffice. And truly an extraordinary calling will suffice at any time ; but then very much better proofs are expected to make such extraordinary Vocation apparent to equal judges, than we can any where find in the Apologies of them that rest wholly upon that, as their safest Anchorage in this unhappy fluctuating Vocation.

By what therefore we can judge from the description the Scriptures give us of a *formed Church*, and sentence of the Ancient, no Society a Church, can be truly and formally called, which wants lawful and ordinary Pastours and Priests ; and no ordinary Pastours or Priests without due Ordination, and no due Ordination but from such who have that power in a right Line communicated unto them, in a succession of mortal Persons, to an immortal faculty in the Church, as may hereafter in convenient place be farther proved. So that it may well be admitted, that Succession (not when one steps up unappointed, or illegally appointed into the place and office of another, but ) thus explained is necessary to the Being of a true Church of Christ. And yet I do not say it is necessary to Christianity, or simply to salvation, where it is not despised or scornfully rejected. For we may well suppose that Gods promises will not so far fail as to leave a Christian people destitute of such ordinary means of becoming a Church, without notorious forfeitures of his grace on their parts ; or will remit of the general rigor of his Laws requiring Unity of a Church, as well as Unity of Faith to the being good Christians and true believers.

And for these who are most troublesome and loud in demanding Succession, or rejecting all Churches defective therein, as scarce in saveable condition ; though I hold it an high temptation of God and provocation of highest displeasure, to flock to such Societies as are not known to have this succession of Pastors without such interruption that the Renewal and restitution thereof were meer Laical, and consequently void ; yet where invincible ignorance, through education or incapacity natural of judging, hath subjected a Christian to that unhappiness, who dares exclude him from salvation ? And the greatest boasters and magnifiers of succession should do well to consider, how they can better, than hitherto they have,

*Nihil aliud est, quantum ego quidem intelligo, Ordinaria Dei ad aliquam munus vocatio, quam ab his penes quos est plena & legitima de ejusmodi rebus statuendi potestas, persona ipsorum judicio non inidonea, nullo intercedente prava ambitione, dolo, malisve artibus, & signata. Sanderfonus Præfatad Tract. de Juramento.*

quit and secure themselves from the retort of want of succession. For however a numerous, a glorious Roll is shewn of succeeders in their principal See, yet we find unanswerable difficulties in their due succession and ordination: of which these two will take them up more time, and cost them more care and pains than their lives length may suffice to; viz. The uncertainty of Succession from Intention necessary to that Sacrament of Ordination, which can never be sufficiently known to have been present at that time, no, though the Ordainer should swear solemnly to it, more than *Morally*, which amounts to no more, upon tryal, than Probably: And the more then probable suspicion of Simoniackal contracts in ascending the Pastoral throne; which the common Law declareth, nulling such indirect Invasions, and voiding Ordinations.

For the third sign of the true Catholick Church, Unity; the more I look into it, the less I find considerable in it: It being necessary according to common Philosophy, That every thing which hath a Being, should be but one, and not many: and if the Catholick Church be so in this sense, what great matter is acknowledged in it above other things? For when a thing is divided into many parts, it ceases to be what it was before, but still there is unity in the Parts severally considered. And so if we suppose the Universal Church divided schismatically into distinct and opposite societies, it can scarce be supposed but the Parties so divided are, though infinite, yet in unity with themselves. And how then can that which is common to so many be a specifick character of one especially? By this separation therefore it may be concluded, That one, or perhaps both are in fault, and guilty, but agreeing within themselves equally, (as well they may) and for ought appears, the Schismatical may be in greater unity within it self than the Catholick, how can any man discern from unity, which is the Catholick or true Church. The Unity therefore, which may any wise describe or distinguish the sounder part of Christs Church from the heretical, must not be taken from that which it holdeth within it self, but with some other, which is acknowledged for Catholick; wherein comes the use of Antiquity again: because the Ancient Churches of Christ were saved by the same Faith and Worship that all succeeding Churches must be; therefore, if it may appear that a Church doth not agree in all necessary or considerable points of Faith, Worship, and Government with them of former ages, supposed to be truly Catholick, it self cannot be Catholick or a true Christian Church. But they who look no higher than one Age, or two, and no farther then one place or two, and finding convenient agreement amongst themselves, do characterise themselves for Christs Church, fall into the censure of St. Paul to the

2 Cor. 10. 12. *Corinthians — who measuring themselves by themselves, and comparing themselves among themselves, are not wise.* And in the Revelation of St. John, we read of some Nations into whose heart God hath put to fulfill his will, and to agree and give their Kingdom unto the Beast, until the word of God should be fulfilled. I hope this unity of consent, will not be taken for any argument of the faithfulness of their consent or Catholickness. But more we shall have occasion to speak of Unity in the treating of Schism. In the mean time, I see no force at all in the places alledged out of the Old Testament, to prove so much as may be well allowed to the unity of the Church; as where it is said, *My Beloved is but one*, and to the like purpose. For such places, taken in relation to Fact, and not to Precept and counsel rather, that Gods Church should be so, and endeavour

2 Cor. 10. 12.

Revel. 17. 7.

Cantic.



to keep the Spirit of Unity in the bond of peace, as the Apostle speaks, can be understood strictly, only of that single Nation of the Jews, which was alone chosen so peculiarly to himself. Or of the future Coalition of Jew and Gentile into one Body, as the same Apostle in the same Epistle speaketh of Christs Passion, *That he might reconcile both unto God in one Body by the Cross, having slain the enmity thereby; i. e. between Jew and Gentile.*

Ephes. 4. 3.

Chap. 2. 16.

These difficulties and uncertainties in this Note of Unity have constrained the Patrons of the Roman Cause to find out such an Unity which indeed is more apparent, and certain to him that commits his Faith to be guided by some outward sign; but so much repugnant to all ancient Churches, so wholly strange to them, and unheard of, that it may seem to do them much more mischief than advantage, as that which excludes all Antiquity from having any suffrage in this cause. And this their Note is, Unity with the Bishop of *Rome*: as boldly said, and as weakly proved as their enemies could wish. St. *Hierom* indeed saith to *Damasus*, he is resolved to hold as He and that See believed in one particular of the Trinity, and used not simply, and abstractly consider'd this as a probable argument of Orthodoxy and preserving the peace of the Church, but with the concurrence of other Circumstances rendring his Opinion probable. But doth he, or any ancient Author, deserving with themselves the name of a Father, teach, as they would persuade, indefinitely, That to hold communion with the Bishop of *Rome* is to be assured you are of the true Catholic Church. Christs Charter much stood upon to St. *Peter*, and the Rhetorical flourishes many times of the Holy Fathers extolling St. *Peter* and his Successors, but never categorically affirming, or soberly determining so, will not amount to this.

Bellarm. de  
Noris Eccles.  
lib. 4. cap. 10.  
init.

Hence they proceed to Universality too, as a sign of the true Church, and an help to Unity it self. For it profiteth nothing that there be some one Church, and that in one Age and Place which is at unity with it self, if it be not universal. Christs Church is said to be universal, but so many senses are given of Universality it self, that it is hard to apply it positively to any pretending to it. For nothing so plain as that the Christian Faith doth not, and never did possess all Nations; nor all the persons of those Nations where it hath flourished. No man therefore can know the true Church by that which is not true of it. And therefore I make no doubt but the most anciently genuine and proper sense of that expression in the Apostles Creed, where it is said, *I believe the Catholick Church*, aimed at no more than to cause us to believe that Christs Church was from that time forward, no longer to be of one Nation or one Denomination, as it was before Christs Incarnation, but Catholick; that is, *Universal*, and indifferently to extend to all People: For at that time when the Creed was composed, the secondary sense wherein *Catholick* and *sound Believer* signified the same thing, was scarce at all heard of; no not before the Council of *Nice* under *Constantine*. Afterwards it was applied to particular Sees, as well *Alexandrian*, *Antiochian*, and some others, as *Roman*. In *Theodosius* the second his dayes, which above 400 years after Christ, a Law was made that none should call themselves Catholicks but such as believed aright concerning the Holy Trinity; the rest should be termed Hereticks. Afterward, notwithstanding every Sect and Heresie usurped that name: as may appear from that very place corruptly cited out of *Austin* by some, to prove the true Church from the Title of *Catholick* it self.

Vide Augu-  
stinum, Epi-  
stola 50.Sozomenus  
Ecclesiast.  
Hist. lib. 7.  
cap. 4.August. Epist.  
ad Epistolam  
Fundamenti.

For

For faith he, however all Hereticks desire to be called Catholicks, yet if any enquired for a Catholick Church, they were directed to the Orthodox, and not Heretical Churches.

But if we take the word *Catholick* in a more restrained sense, not for that which is all over the world actually, but so far as it doth extend, passeth generally through all; and that not Places, but Ages too, where shall we find a Catholick Church? Christians never for fourteen or fifteen hundred yeers not conspiring into one belief, no not in things held very important to Faith: and I mean not only single persons, but Societies of Christians. Therefore, neither from hence can we conclude directly of the true Church, in opposition to Heretical. And therefore the Patrons of this opinion of the Universality, finding themselves harder pursued with difficulties, than they can evade being taken in their own snares, are forced, according to their very vain custom, to leave off the tryal of the truth from matter of Fact, which is most plain and ready, and proceed to say, *It ought so to be*: for certain reasons they draw at their pleasure out of Scripture, and the necessity of our knowledge of it: which is as solid a way of proceeding, as if I finding my self by natural sense cold, another should attempt to demonstrate the contrary, because it is Midsummer.

But this use we may yet make of Universality to judge of Catholickness of Faith, taking it for the most constant for time, place, and persons, according as all humane account requires to ascribe that to the more numerous and eminent, which is strictly proper only to the whole entire Body, as a Councel or Senate is said to decree a thing, when the chiefeſt do so, some dissenting: surely this is a very probable argument of the Catholickness of that Faith, and consequently that Church so believing: But what we before observed must not be forgotten here, *viz.* That in all such enquiries as these, the Estimate must be taken from the whole Church passed as well as Present, and that there is as well an Eminency of Ages, as Persons, to preponderate in this Case.

Lastly, the advantage Negative from Universality is very considerable to discern the true Faith and Church from false, because it is most certain, if any Doctrine or Discipline shall be obtruded on the Church, which cannot be made evident to have been actually received in the Church (and not by colourable and probable conjectures and new senses of Scripture invented to that purpose) in some former Age, that is Heretical and Schismatical, and in no good sense Catholick.

The last Note which we shall mention is Sanctity, which we hold very proper to this end, taken abstractedly from all Persons, as considered in Doctrine and Principles. For if any Church doth teach contrary to the Law of nature, of moral vertues, of Justice, or the like, we may well conclude that to be a false Church, though it keeps it self never so strictly to the Rule of Scriptures in many, or most other things. For it is in the power of mans wit, and may be in the power of his hands, to devise certain Religious Acts, and impose them on others, which shall carry a greater shew of severity and sanctity than there is any grounds for in Scripture, or Presidents in the best approved Churches: and yet this is not true Holiness of Believers. For to this is principally required, that it be regulated and warranted by Gods holy Word: Yet neither so directly and expressly as if it were unlawful to act any thing in order to Holiness without special precept from thence. For I see no cause at all to reject the  
ancient

ancient distinction found frequently with the Fathers of the Church; of duties of Precept, and duties of Council: For there ever was, and ought to be in Christs Church several ranks of Professours of Christs Religion; whereof, for instance, some live more contemplative, some more active lives. But if all commendable and profitable States were under Precept, then should all sin that do not observe the same: but God hath taken a mean course in not commanding some things of singular use to the promoting of Piety in true Believers, but commending the same unto us: Such are Virginal chastity, Monastick life, Travelling painfully not only towards the salvation of a mans own soul, but of others likewise; and certain degrees uncommanded of Duties commanded; as of charity towards our Christian neighbours, & Watchings unto Prayer, and spiritual Devotion; which being prescribed, no man can determine to what degree they are by God required of us precisely: some therefore are left to the Freewill-offerings of devouter persons, who thereby endeavour either to assure themselves more fully of their salvation; or increase of the glory afterward to be received: For as Christ tells us in the Gospel, *Much was forgiven to Mary, because she loved much*, so shall much be given upon the same reason.

They therefore that teach contrary to such wholesome and useful means of Holiness as these, or the like, under, perhaps, vain suspicion of too great opinion may be had of their worthiness, incur, at least with me, the censure of being enemies to the holiness of Christs Church, and render their Churches more suspected for the opposing of them, than others for approving or practising them.

The Holiness then of the Church commending it to the eye and admiration of the World, doth consist in the divineness and spiritualness of its Doctrine and Ecclesiastical discipline in use in it, exceeding moral civility. For it may be that such a severe hand of civil Justice may be held over a people that they may live more orderly and inoffensively to the world than some true Christian Churches: but if this be done, as often it is, out of civil Prudence, natural Gravity, or a disposition inclined rather to get an estate, than riotously and vainly to spend on, which brings such scandal to Religion, then is not this a sign of a true Church, or Christian, because it proceedeth not from principles proper to Christian Religion, but secular interest, how specious soever it may appear to the World.

CHAP.



## CHAP. XXXI.

*Of the Power and Acts of the Church. Where they are properly posited. Of the Fountain of the Power denied to the Church. Neither Prince nor People Authour of the Churches Power: But Christ the true Head of the Church. The manner how Christs Church was founded. Four Conclusions upon the Premisses. 1. That there was alwayes distinction of Persons in the Church of Christ. 2. The Church was alwayes administred principally by the Clergy. 3. The Rites generally received in the Church, necessary to the conferring Clerical Power and Office. 4. All are Usurpers of Ecclesiastical Power who have not thus received it. In what sense Kings may be said to be Heads of the Church.*

**A**fter the Church found, and founded as abovesaid, the special Acts thereof claim due consideration, and the Power or Right of so acting. And this Power we make two-fold in General, Political and Mystical, or Sacramental: Of both which we must first enquire after the proper Subject, before we treat of the proper Acts thereof.

That all Power which is given by Christ doth reside in the Church as its subject, no man can, or doth question. But because the Church it self being (as is said) a Society united in one Faith, and administred outwardly by Christian Discipline, according to Christs mind, admitteth of several senses and acceptations; therefore it must be first understood, which, and in what sense is according to Christs intention, the proper seat of this power. And before we come to Scriptural grounds, we take no small help in this Enquiry from the common state of all Government: which we have already shewn to be such as is not *ascending*, but *descending*: It cometh not originally, nor can, from the multitude or people, who are the object of this power, *i.e.* the Persons properly to be governed, and not governing; all the Examples of former Ages confirming not only the unnaturalness and unreasonableness, but impossibility of the People governing themselves.

For

For though infinite Instances may be given of Cities, and Nations, which have wrung the Civil Power out of the hands of their Princes and Magistrates, and pretended they would be ruled by their own Counsels and power: yet could they never effect this, but were constrained, after all devices used to no purpose, to let go their hold, if not Pretensions, and suffer the assumed Power to return to a more capable subject. Which incapacity of using such Power is no less than an unanswerable Demonstration to me that it was never there placed by any divine Will or Right; but somewhere else. Now though some eminent Reformers of the Late Age have been so superfluously, and in truth, superstitiously nice, and as is pretended, jealous for Christs honour and absolute Headship over his Church, that would not so much as allow the name of Government to the Church or any in it, lest Christ should suffer loss, but *administration* must be the name signifying power and Rule exercised in the Church; yet in truth, all this is no better than a Superstitious fear, where there is no fear. For they are not names, but things that are so much to be heeded: And if these men in their Charge, had not acted the part of Governours, as well as others, we might have allowed this invention for tollerable, but the truth is, the honour pretended to Christ, and the Gentle usage of the People have ended in the same thing which the other more openly and honestly professed to do: the difference being only in the Hands so acting. But 'tis no new thing to beguile dissembled people with new words, into new orders, neither will it ever be left off, as common a Stratagem as it is, so long as the People, are people, and Craft and Ambition shall spurr men of Fortune to currie, and scratch that unruly beast, to the end that, when they find it convenient, they may get up of them, and ride them at their pleasure.

Junius de  
Ecclesia.

This incapacity of all Christians to rule themselves being the same with the other, necessarily inferreth a more proper subject of that Power, which not being assumed but delivered, any more then the Faith it self, founds a distinction of Christians and the Church, as ancient as the Church it self; not unknown to Civil Societies. For as hath been said, a Kingdom or Commonwealth is said to decree and act such a thing, when not the thousand part thereof so much as know any thing of it, till it be done: so that clearly, there is a Nation Real and Representative, and Formal and proper. This consisteth of all Persons in that Society, and every member of that Political Bodie: The other, of such Principal Parts of that Bodie as are in Possession of authority and power to Rule the rest: and whose Acts are interpreted to be the Acts of the whole State. And that the Church consisting of infinite Persons incapable of consulting or acting Decretorily, must, and alwayes had certain Select Persons representing the whole, which it should conclude; the thing it self together with Precedents of all Places and Ages do prove. The greatest arguments and most colourable are taken from the Infancy of the Church, to the contrary. For both Hereticks and Schismaticks endeavour at contrary conclusions from the Scripture. Patrons of the Popes absoluteness argue from a Superiority or Primacy of order in St. *Peter* when the Church consisted, it may be, of twenty persons to make good the Popes pretensions to supremacy over the universal Church, when it consisteth of so many Nations. But to this our answer is ready: First, that the like power was never in St. *Peter* over his fellow Apostles and the Rest that is claimed by the Present Bishop of Rome. Secondly, That if such a Power as is asserted to St. *Peter* for the Popes sake had ever been in him really, yet it could be no good ground of his Successors claiming

claiming the same over the Catholick Church. And that First, because there is no probability of the like Gifts and Graces requisite to such Authority in the Popes of Rome, as were given by Christ to St. *Peter*; yea, there are more instances to be given of the Ignorance, and horrible vitiousness of Persons possessing that Chair, then in any other Patriarchal See in Christendom. Secondly, There is no Rule of Certainty (setting aside the Personal incapacities and imperfections) how far the Apostolical power was derived to their Successors, but what may be taken from the end of such power, which was to conserve the Church in due order of Government, Devotion and Faith, and this may as well and better be performed without one Persons engrossing to himself the Disposal of all things Primarily, though not in the Execution. Thirdly, the difference is vast between the Church consisting of so few, and contracted into so narrow a circuit as at the first founding of it, when one man might have with great facility taken the whole management of the Church upon him, and in following Ages, when it was diffused into so many and far distant quarters of the Universe, not to be inspected or managed by one man, though an Apostle.

On the other side, Persons of Democratical Principles and purposes, finding in holy Writ that the whole Church without distinction of Persons were often assembled together, and that during their such meeting, matters concerning the due administration of the Church, were treated of, collected from thence, that in right, and not rather occasionally, they concurred to Publick Acts of the Church: but this likewise is a fallacy, without any necessity of consequence, as will appear from the original and orderly search made into the first Constitution, and the gradual Progress of Ecclesiastical Persons and functions.

First then, That Christ is the Head of the Church, and under that General notion of Power, life and motion doth communicate his influence unto his Body, the Scripture is so manifest, and it is so generally and willingly by all assented to, that it were lost time to insist on it. He is then by immediate consequence the fountain of all Power resting in that Body; as doth appear from the several Appellations subordinate to that of Head attributed unto him in Scripture. For Hebrews the third and first, he is called *The Apostle of our profession*. And in the Book of the Acts he is stiled that Prophet which was in Deuteronomie promised to the true Israel. And an Evangelist he is made to us by his own words verifying the Prediction of *Esaïas* upon himself, Saying, The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he hath anointed me to preach the Gospel. And St. *Peter* calleth him our Bishop. Doctor or Master he claims as proper to himself in St. *Mathew*: And to the Hebrews, as before, he is called a Priest, an High priest, yea lastly, a Deacon or Minister, for the words properly used signify the same thing. From all which we may gather both the Efficient and Exemplary cause of the several orders in Christ: For first, we read how he called unto himself twelve Apostles, as well to minister under him, during his abode upon earth, as to Preside and inform his Church after his departure out of this World: which according to St. *Hierome* were prefigured by the twelve fountains, the twelve Patriarchs, the twelve Tribes, the twelve Princes of the Tribes. There he not only elected, but ordained also, as St. *Mark* testifieth, that they should be with him, and that he might send them out to preach, naming them Apostles, as St. *Luke* writeth. After the choice and Ordination of them, he gave them actual Mission, as it appeareth by St. *Mathew*, and Commission to preach, and to work miracles to the confirmation of his Doctrine: and to receive a reward for their pains. And

Heb. 3. 1.  
Acts. 3. 22.  
Deut. 18. 15.  
Luk. 4. 18.

1 Pet. 2. 25.  
Mat. 23. 10.

Rom. 15. 8.

Exod. 15. 27.  
Mark. 3. 14.

Luk. 6. 13.  
Mat. 10. 1.  
Luk. 9. 2.  
Math. 10. 1.  
Math. 10. 10.



And when the Harvest was too great for so few Labourers as twelve, St. Luke tells us, he added Adjutants to them, seventy Disciples answerable to the seventy Elders, by Gods appointment set over the children of Israel: and the seventy Souls that went with Jacob into Egypt. These two orders are thought to be intended by St. Paul to the Ephesians, where he maketh mention of Apostles and Prophets: by Prophets meaning such who bare that part of the Prophetical office, which consisted in ordinary instruction of the People, of which in other places likewise he speaketh. Now adding to these the common sort of Christians or Disciples, which were if not at the time of Christs abode upon earth, yet afterward, Christians: as St. Paul intimateth, where he affirmeth *Christ was seen after his resurrection of above five hundred brethren at once.* We have three distinct orders of Christians. First Apostles; secondly Evangelists, or the seventy; Thirdly simple Believers or Christians. And it is most certain that as the Apostles did not so much as choose their Lord, nor the Evangelists the Apostles, so the Common sort did not then constitute or choose their Preachers or Evangelists: but while Christ continued on earth he kept the power of Ordination of whom he pleased in his own hands, and never is it so much as insinuated that upon his departure he left any power in their hands to dispose Ecclesiastical Affairs or Persons therein: but that with his Apostles as succeeding him in visible Administration, he deposited this power many arguments are offer'd us out of Scripture. For in the Person of St. Peter he gave power to all the Apostles saying, *Feed my sheep.* And that this same power resting in them was by them transmitted unto others, the very same form of words almost used by St. Peter himself to be the Governours of the Church, do prove: where he saith, *Feed the Flock of God which is among you, taking the oversight thereof not by constraint, but willingly.* And St. Paul in the Acts of the Apostles likewise. And that the whole Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction was entirely in the Apostles and Apostolical Persons, doth appear from the enumeration of the most principal parts of which such Jurisdiction doth consist, which may be these as we find them in Scripture recorded. 1. Power of determining Controversies of Religion, as appeareth from the Question agitated about keeping the Law of Moses, and concluded by the Apostles, and Elders which were of the second Order after the Apostles. And in the eleventh of the Acts, the same resolved the doubt concerning the Converſing with Gentiles. 2. Of imposing Laws and orders for the due and sober conversation in matters of Moral nature, as may be gathered from St. Paul to the Thessalonians, where he adviseth, *That Christians study to be quiet and to do their own business, and to work with their own hands as we commanded you.* And so in the second Epistle he thus writeth, *Now we command you brethren in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye withdraw your selves from every brother that walketh disorderly, and not after the tradition which he received of us.* And so verse the twelfth of the same Chapter.

Thirdly, Censurings and Punishments of the refractory and disorderly: and that of two sorts, First of suspension and interdicting, as did the Disciples of Christ suspected Preachers of him; in St. Luke, *John answered and said, Master we saw one casting out Devils in thy name, and we forbade him, because he followeth not with us.* And so others they restrain who preached without their command or exceeded their commission: as may be read in the acts of the Apostles; by vertue of the same censuring Power St. Paul interdicts women from preaching in the Church. Secondly, the Censure of

Luk. 10. 1.  
Numb. 11. 10

Gen. 46.  
Eph. 3. 5.

1 Cor. 15. 6.

Joh. 21. 19.

1 Pet. 5. 2.

Acts. 20. 28.

Acts. 15.

Acts. 11.

1 Thes. 4. 11.

2 Thes. 3. 6.

Luk. 9. 49.

Acts. 15. 24.  
25.  
1 Tim. 2. 12.

excommunication and separation of incorrigible and notorious offenders in the Church from communion in the Church: For St. Paul writing to the Corinthians in this manner; *What will ye? shall I come unto you with a rod or in Love, and in the spirit of meekness?* doth evidently distinguish a two-fold power resident in him: of severity to chastise, and meekness to comfort and support. And this power is more plainly expressed in the exercise thereof upon the scandalous offender in incestuous marriage: As also in the formidable proceedings against *Hymeneus* and *Alexander*, whom St. Paul delivered unto Satan, that they might learn not to blaspheme: and several other things more proper for some other place.

A Fourth instance of Jurisdiction is seen in the power of Ordination pertaining to the Apostles, by imposition of hands. For they did ordain those Deacons mentioned in the Acts of the Apostles. And St. Paul to Timothy, exhorting him to *Stir up the gift of God which is in thee, by the putting on of his hands*, doth declare the Act of Ordination used by himself.

From all which, these four conclusions do necessarily follow. First, that by Christ and his Apostles intention, there were alwayes, in their dayes, distinction of persons in the Church: some having the power of Rule, and some being subject: according to the Comparifon of St. Paul to the Corinthians of the natural order and superiority of, and subjection of the Members in a natural Body, to one another: and coming to application, he saith, *And God hath set some in the Church, First Apostles: secondarily Prophets, thirdly Teachers, after that Miracles:* And by demanding, and Questioning, doth vehemently deny a Parity in the Church. And this distinction of Persons was no otherwise known at first but by the common name of Brethren, given to such as were Christians, without any authority in the Church: and therefore we read often of the Apostles and their Party on the one side, and Brethren on the other. But the Officers and Rulers of the Church are not found to have any general name distinguishing them from others, but were by their particular charges and Offices known to men: as Apostles, Elders, Bishops, Evangelists, Deacons. But afterward, compendiousness of speech, general comprehension of them so distinct requiring, they received their several Names, not, as *Socinus*, *Salmasius*, and some such presumptuous traders for Anarchy in the Church would have it, the things themselves, or being. For it is granted, that at first all true believers were called indifferently *καὶ ὅς*, or Gods Portion or Clergy as we now speak. For it is very probable that St. Peter using that word which we render Clergy, doth intend to comprehend thereby all Christian People, as well as they who (as St. Hierome saith are the Lords portion more peculiarly: But with good advice afterward, they who were more especially dedicated to Gods service, and attended his Altar, were signal-ly called the Clergy: and the other the Laity or people: very agreeably to the phrase of the Old Testament, where we find not only a distinction in the things themselves; but in the names of such as served any ways in Gods house, and those who were only Israelites at large. For these were called simply *בְּנֵי הָעָם* Sons of the People, or the Laity (as we now adayes speak) in opposition to the Levites, which discrimination in terms was thought to be introduced in *Josiah's* time.

Secondly: From what is said we may conclude that even before, and after this distinction, all the administration of Church affairs passed through the hands of these Persons of the Clergy or Ecclesiastical Functions, and that their Votes and Acts ever went under the name of the Church

1 Cor. 4. 21.

1 Cor. 5. 3, 4.

Acts. 6. 5, 6.

2 Tim. 1. 6.

1 Cor. 12.

v. 28.

v. 29, 30.

Acts. 11. 1, 12, 17, 15, 23, 16. 2.

*Clerus dicimur  
quia fors Dei  
sumus. Hieron.  
Item Præfat.  
ad Enarrat.  
August. Psal.  
1 Pet. 5. 3.*

2 Chron. 35  
7. 12.  
Vid. Varab. in  
Locum.

Church, it may be that in the beginning of the Church, when Christians had not so many advantages, as after they had, and their convenience of assembling was not so great, but they were constrained to teach, and pray, and determine controversies, and ordain Laws for the Church, that the Laity (as we now call them) were present at all these; but that this fortuitous presence should infer a right, nothing appears.

A third Conclusion may be, That, observing the orderly Rites used to invest any person with a Clerical Power, it must necessarily follow, that they who wanted them, never attained the thing it self. For the Author to the Hebrews asserts plainly the sacredness of Evangelical Ministering, from the Prescriptions and practise of the Levitical, saying, *No man takes this office upon him but he that was called of God, as was Aaron*; and least it might be presumed that this strickness concerned the Old Law only, he proceedeth to that greatest of Precedents, Christ himself: who, though he needed not any Institution, being absolutely free to all such purposes, of himself; yet was called of God in signal manner; to shew that all that exercise such Sacred function should much more be thereunto orderly called. Now to understand what this ordinary and orderly call is, the better, it is worth the observing how *Aaron* was called, for so in proportionable manner ought all under the Gospel be ordained to the Ministry. And here first, we may note, there is not the least intimation given of such a Call as is Internal, upon which many vainly rest: But *Aaron* was called not only internally, by certain proper and sufficient Gifts to that Office; but externally, and that not of himself, but of another: He was called by God. Now least it should be here suspected that a bare and bold presumption of being called of God, without some outward evidence proving the same, might suffice to justify an Intruder of himself into the Ministry; the Scripture tells us how *Aaron* was called of God; and that is not only of God and immediately, but mediately, by man; that is, by *Moses*. Nay farther, because many content themselves with such an Ordination as comes from another, not examining much what power or Right such persons have so to ordain others, the Scriptures tell us, that *Aaron* was called by another, and him appointed specially by God so to do: as we read, Exodus the 28. 1. where God commandeth *Moses* saying, *And take thou unto thee Aaron thy Brother, and his sons with him, from among the children of Israel, that they may minister unto me, in the Priests Office*. Here is their Election or Vocation: Their consecration or ordination followeth afterward, described particularly according to its several Ceremonies, in the next chapter: So that we see the great Example or Figure of Evangelical ordination, directeth to such a form as ought to be of God, by the hands of some who are thereunto appointed: And if any should here interpose that *Moses* himself was no Priest properly himself, though he were of the Tribe of Levi, and yet he consecrated Priests, being himself rather a Civil Magistrate; and from hence argue a power in Lay-men, especially Magistrates, to do the same now adayes. I answer, here indeed doth *Calvins* defence of himself, and such as are in like condition take place of an Ordinary call and an Extraordinary. For before God had settled a Rule and Order in his Church, the extraordinary and immediate hand of God, did appoint persons to minister before. It was therefore first of all, an Extraordinary Act in God to call *Moses*, rather than any others, to direct and Rule his Church; it was next an Extraordinary Act in him to separate the whole Tribe of Levi to Minister before him: but from that time forward, there was no such thing heard

Heb. 5. 4.

Exod. 2. 1.



heard of, as an Extraordinary Call. Secondly, I answer that God prescribing to us Rules and Precedents, doth not thereby so tie his own hands, as he doth ours; but when he pleaseth, he may create Persons in Extraordinary manner, to what ends he will: And his Authority infallibly granted to those, we call now, *Lay-men*, is altogether sufficient to make a Priest of what Order or dignity soever he shall be. But until such infallible Proofs of either Gods immediate Calling, which is Extraordinary indeed; or his immediate enabling or empowering any other Person, not having in the ordinary Course established in his Church, received such a power, be given; all such Extraordinary assuming of the Ministry on a mans self is more then one way Extraordinary, and to be rejected as void. And with such no good and conscientious Christian ought to Communicate, as with Priests; that is, as Offering the Spiritual Sacrifice of Prayer and Praise unto God as a Legitimate and Publick Minister of God, or Mediatour of the People, or that Mystical Sacrifice in the Eucharist; and especially going upon the grounds of *Luther, Calvin, Perkins* and some others of Great note: that all Sacerdotal (they may call them if they please Ministerial) Acts done by him who is no true Minister, are really null and void.

Fourthly, we conclude, that seeing all Ecclesiastical power, as Ecclesiastical, doth proceed from Christ, and his Successors, and that by Ordinary and visible means, they who have not received the same by such Ordinary Methods, are usurpers of the same, whether Political or Mystical. And that to deny this to the Church, is to deny that which Christ hath given them, and such a Principle of the Churches well Being, without which it cannot subsist; and it not subsisting, neither can the Faith it self. And to the reason above given we may add Prescription, beyond all memory. For from Christs time to this day a perpetual and peculiar power hath ever been in the Clergy (which hath constantly likewise born the name of the Church) to assemble, define, and dispose matters of Religion. And why should not Prescription under Unchristian, as well as Christian Governours for so many Ages together, be as valid, sacred, and binding to acknowledgment in the Case of Religion, as Civil Matters; will ever remain a question, in Conscience and common Equity, even after irresistible Power hath forced a Resolution otherwise.

It is true, such is the more natural and Ancient Right Civil Power hath over the outward Persons of men, than that which Religion hath over the Inward man, that it may claim a dominion and disposal of the Persons of even Christian subjects, contrary to the soft and infirm Laws of the Church: because (as hath been said) Men are Men, before they are Christians; and Nature goeth before Grace: And Civil society is the *Basis*, and support to Ecclesiastical. Yet the grounds of Christianity being once received for good and divine; and that Religion cannot subsist, nor the Church consist without being a Society; and no Society without a Right of counsel, and consultation; and no consultation without a Right to assemble together; the Right of assembling must needs be in triuque to the Church it self. Now, if no man that is a Christian can take away the essential ingredient to the Church, how can any deny this of Assembling? For the practise of it constantly and confidently by the Apostles and brethren, contrary to the express will of the Lawful Powers of the Jews and Romans, and the reason given in the Acts of the Apostles of obeying God rather then man, do imply certainly a Law and Charter from  
God

God so to do, and if this be granted, as it must, who can deny by the same Rule, necessity of Cause, and constant Prescription, that they may as well provide for the safety of the Faith by securing the state of the Church; as for the truth, and stability of the Church, by securing the true Faith, by doctrine and determination.

The Great question hath ever been, Whether the Church should suffer loss of power and priviledges upon the Supream Powers becoming Christian: Or the Supream power it self, loose that dominion which it had before it became of the Church? For, if Christianity subjected Kings necessarily to the Laws of others, not deriving from them, then were not Kings in so good a Condition after they were Christians as before; when they had no such pretences or restraints upon them: and so should Christs Law destroy, or maim at least, the Law of God, by which Kings reign. But there may be somewhat said weakning this absurdity. For Granting this, That there is a God, and that he is to be worshipped, and that as he appointeth (all which we must by nature believe) it seems no less natural to have these observed, than the Laws of natural Dominion. Now granting that at present, which (if we be true to our Religion) we must not deny: *viz.* That Christian Religion is the true Religion, and that God will be worshipped in such sort as is therein contained; For any Prince absolute, to submit to the essentials of that Religion, is not to loose any thing of his Pristine Rights which he had before being an Heathen (for he never had any Right to go against the Law of God, more then to go against the Law of Nature) but it doth restrain his Acts, and the exercise of his Power. And if the Supream, after he hath embraced Christianity, shall proceed to exert the same Authority over the Church, as before; yet the Church hath no power to resist or restrain him, Civilly; any more than when he was an Alien to it.

Now it being apparent that Christian Faith and Churches had their Forms of believing, and Communion before Sovereign powers were converted; and that he, who is truly converted to a Religion, doth embrace it, upon the terms which he there finds, not such as he brings with him or devises; therefore there lies an Obligation upon such powers, to preserve the same, as they found it, inviolate. And truly, for any secular Power to become Christian, with a condition of inverting the orders of the Church, and deluting the Faith, is to take away much more than ordinary accrues unto it by such a change. It is true, the distinction is considerable between the Power of a Christian, and unchristian King, exerted in this manner; because taking the Church in the Largest sense, in which all Christians in Communion are of it, what Christian Kings act with the Church, may, in some sense, bear the name of the Church, as it doth in the State, acting according to their secular capacity, but much more improperly than here: because there are no inferiour Officers, or Magistrates in such a Commonwealth, which are not of his founding and institution; whatsoever they do referr to him, and whatsoever almost he doth, is executed by them. But Christ (as we have shewed) having ordained special Officers of his own, which derive not their Spiritual Power at all, from the Civil; and to this end that his Church might be duly taught and governed, what is done without the concurrence of these, can in no proper sense bear the name of the Church. But many say, the King is a Mixt person consisting partly of Ecclesiastical and partly Civil Authority: but this taken in the ordinary latitude, is to begg the Question, and more a great deal than at first was demanded

manded. For who knows how far this Mixture extends, and that it comprehends not the Mystical Power of the Church, as well as the Political: And how have they proved one more than the other, by such a title? It were reasonable therefore, first to declare his Rights in Ecclesiastical matters, as well as Civil, and thence conclude, he is a Mixt Person; and not to affirm barely he is a *Mixt Person*, and from thence infer they know not what Ecclesiastical power themselves. And if he hath such power, whether it is immediately of God annexed to his Natural Right; or, by consent of the Church, is attributed unto him. For by taking this course we may reconcile many otherwise contrary opinions found amongst the Ancient Fathers, sometimes ascribing much of the Ecclesiastical Power to Christian Emperours, and sometimes calling the same in question.

The Church of England, so far as she hath declared herself herein, seemeth to take the mean way, and follow herein the Prescriptions of the Old Testament: and the Precedents of Christian Emperours found in the Antient Church, under the Gospel, and doth profess to be the due of our Kings, as much as ever any Kings upon earth, to sway in Ecclesiastical matters. In execution of which power, as there was alwayes approbation moderated according to the customes of the Church, so was there always Opposition when the bounds were exceeded. And undoubtedly true is That we are taught by our Church to acknowledge, *That whatever in Church matters was the Right of Jewish Kings, or Christian Emperours of Old, is now the Right of our Kings.*

Constitutions  
and Canons  
Church of  
England Can.  
2.

But some not content herewith have out of the Title of Head given at the first attempts of Reformation to our King, and made by acts of State Hereditary to his successors, drawn an argument to prove all that power which rested in the Church to be devolved on the Kings of this Nation. But this hath ever been disowned and disclaimed in such a large sense by themselves, as appears by Queen *Elizabeths* Injunctions, and an Act of Parliament in confirmation whereof: I shall here only recite the opinion or testimony of Bishop *Jewel* in his view of *Pius Quintus* his seditious Bull against her, in these his own word. *Where is she called Supream Head? Peruse the Acts of Parliament, the Records, the Rolls, and the Writs of Chancery or Exchequer which pass in her Graces name. Where is she ever called Supream Head of the Church? No, No brethren, she refuseth it, she would not have it, nor be so called: Why then doth Christs Vicar blaze and spread abroad so gross an untruth? &c.* This was her Judgement and modesty then when there was greatest cause to apprehend some such thing: and what the thought of it, I never could learn was ever otherwise interpreted by her Successors. For notwithstanding that, according to the most ancient and undoubted Rights of this Imperial Crown, our Kings are supream Governors of the Church as well as State: yet never was it expounded of the Church as they were Ecclesiastical, but as they were of Civil capacity: For herein differeth the Right of Kings according to our Reformation from that of Roman Perswasion. That Clergy men becoming Sons of the Church, in more especial manner than they of the Laity, are not thereby exempted from the Civil Power, either in matter of propertie, or Criminalness. But the Roman Church so far exalted and extended their Ecclesiastical Power, as to withdraw such Persons and their Cases civil from Civil cognizance, and judgement, and assume it to themselves. And this the Pope claiming very injuriously, as Head of the Church: To root up this usurpation, *Henry* the eight null'd that his pretence, and took the title to himself

Bishop *Jewel*  
against the  
Bull of *Pius*  
5th.



himself intending nothing more then to vindicate his Prerogative in that particular.

For though it cannot be denied that many and great Priviledges to this effect, have been of Old granted by Christian Emperours to eminent Bishops to judge of their own Sons (as they were called) within themselves: yet did they never claim this, as a Native Right of the Church, or Christianity; but as an act of Grace, from the Civil Power. And though the Church, following therein the Councel of *St. Paul*, to go to Law rather before the Just, than unjust: and that Christians should rather determine Causes of differences amongst themselves, by arbitration, than scandalously apply themselves to the Judgement Seat of Heathen, did ever endeavour to determine business within it self, and yet more especially, the Clergy: Yet they never denied a Right in Civil Authority to call them in question, upon misdemeanours, or to decide their Cases of Civil nature. And for the other, of Divine nature, or purely Ecclesiastical, Princes never expected or desired to intermeddle therewith. This the Roman Deputy of *Achaia, Gallio* understood, not to concern his Juridical power, when he refused to be a Judge of such matters, as were esteemed Religious, though in that violence was offered to the body of *St. Paul* before his face, he might, and ought to have shewn his Authority. But when the Sovereign Power became Christian, it was not thought unlawful at all, nor scandalous to address themselves to it for decision of Controversies. And this is it which is intended to be demanded now by our Kings in their Supremacy, in Cases Ecclesiastical and Civil, and acknowledged by the Clergy of this Church to be his due, without that servile way of seeking leave from the Bishop of Rome, or any under him. Onely where it may be showed that Peculiar Grants of Exemptions from the common course of Justice have been made by Princes to the Clergy of the Church, may it not seem equal that they should enjoy the benefit of them, as well as others, in other Cases.

But nothing is more unreasonable or intollerable then the impudence of those spitefully and maliciously bent against the Religion professed in our Church, who argue from the Kings Supremacy over the Church, such an absolute dominion there, as they will by no means acknowledge due to him in the State. If by Acts of Parliament a thing be confirmed to the Commonwealth, it is lookt on as inviolable by the King; and unalterable without the like solemn Revocation, as was the Constitution: But by vertue of the Ancient Right of the Crown, they would have it believed, the King may at his pleasure alter such solemn Acts made in behalf of the Church. Without the concurrence of the Three Estates nothing is lookt upon as a standing Law to the Civil State: but by vertue of this Supremacy Ecclesiastical, they would have it believed that without any more ado, without consent or counsel of the Church, he may make what alteration of Religion he pleases; which was never heard or dreamt of; Yea, and whereas not only his Civil but Ecclesiastical Power always acknowledged the Bounds of common benefit, and extended not to destruction, they would have it thought that he may, when he pleaseth, by vertue of such Headship, destroy the Body of the Church and Religion, and leave none at all, so far at least as the withdrawing of all secular aid and advantage do hasten its ruine. But they will not be of this opinion any longer than they have brought about their mischievous purposes. Surely *St. Paul*, who had nothing to do at all with State matters, and could not touch one that was

1 Cor. 6. 12.

Act. 18.

1 Cor. 5. 12.

2 Cor. 10. 8. without the Church by Ecclesiastical censure, was as much the Head of the Church as ever any Prince in Christendom, doth expressly declare that whatsoever authority he had, it was for the edification and not destruction of the Church. The argument therefore taken from an Hereditary Right in the Crown of England of being Governour and Defendor of our Church to the apparent ruine and destruction of it, we know very well from whence it proceedeth, and whether it tendeth: but where it will end, as yet, God only knows. This we know that Papists are mad when that scoff and reproach which they have constantly put upon both King and Church, from that Title, upon due enquiry makes so little to their purpose. And therefore they will fight with us, with the name only.

## CHAP. XXXII.

*Of the Exercise of the Political power of the Church, in Excommunication. The grounds and Reasons of Excommunication. More things than what is of Faith, matter sufficient of Excommunication. Two Objections answered. Obedience due to Commands, not concerning Faith immediately. Lay-men (though Princes) cannot Excommunicate. Mr. Selden refuted.*

**N**ature in all Bodies that have Life casts out of it what ever corrupts, afflicts or oppresseth the same; and by Struglings and contentions endeavours to deliver it self from such noxious humors as would destroy it. And this is the reason men take Vomits, Purges and Sudorificks, that the deadly humour being expelled, the wholesome may prevail, and the Whole be preserved. There can then be nothing more reasonable or Christian than to put this in practice in Bodies Political or Ecclesiastical. We see how Thieves, Robbers, Murderers, and such like malefactors who are enemies to humane Society, be denied (and that justly) the benefit of that Society against which they have so offended by confinement in Prison or deprivation of Life it self, forfeited justly in seeking or acting the ruine of another. And can any that grants the Communion of Christians to be a Body knit together by its several joints and nerves, and consisting of several Members, deny but the like Evil may befall in its kind, to it, what doth happen to others in another: viz, that some noxious humor of Heresie corrupting the Faith in which, as the Scripture saith of the Blood, is the life of a Christian and the Church it self; may poison it: And some violence of Schism may dissolve or dismember it? And shall not it be allowed the like remedy or means of Cure which are held necessary in like cases? No opinion, how heretical or immoral so ever, is more pernicious to Christian

stian Society than that which absolutely denies power to the Church to eject unsound and tainting members out of it, and to provide for the security of the Body even by the abscission, and destruction of any one Part infesting it. For this opinion strikes not at one part of the Body, but all; neither at one point of Faith, but all; though not immediately and directly, but indirectly and by consequence. For as upon the fall of the House, the persons within must needs be crushed to death, so upon the dissolution of the outward Frame of the Church, the Faith itself must of necessity in a short time perish, and be reduced to nothing. And therefore, those men of reason (as they would be accounted) give us but little cause to think them better men, than Christians, who affirm rawly and loosely, without qualification or due explication of their mind, that no man is to be cast out of the Church but for something which is necessary to salvation, or which Christ doth not require or forbid absolutely: either denying, or not considering (a man can scarce tell which by their works) hereby that Christ, and St. Paul, and our Creed it self require conservation of the unity of the Church, both as a thing admirable in its self, and necessary to the Faith it self. For any man therefore to broach or publish such an opinion as this, That every man may use what Ceremonies he pleases in the publick service of God; or if he pleases he may use none: and this, *That the Church hath no power to command or forbid any thing which is not expressed in the Scripture*: when as Rules general, and several Examples in Scripture justify the contrary. These I say being contrary, not only to some one Church, but all; even those they would by no means have touched thereby, do no less in their consequence, mischief to the Church, than the denial of the Mystery of the Trinity it self; or of Christs incarnation, however I grant they, in their form are nothing, so foul. And therefore I presume to conclude them matter of Excommunication; and so I judge St. Paul doth, where he advises, nay commands in the name of the Lord <sup>2 Thes. 3. 6.</sup> Jesus Christ (the Thessalonians) *to withdraw themselves from every one that walketh disorderly, and not after the tradition he received of us.* These traditions, were (as it is here implied) concerning orders of the Church, and manners of Worship: which in all probability are most of them lost to us, St. Paul therefore requiring that whoever did not walk according to those prescriptions delivered by him, should be separated, doth not warrant the like proceedings now. For tis the very same thing whether the Church withdraws it self, or whether it expells another. When the Israelites warned by Moses departed from the tents of the wicked *Corah, Dathan,* and *Abiram* (who only walked disorderly not erroneously in the matter of worship, that we read of) and their complices, and touched nothing of theirs, they Anathematized them no less than if they had set them packing into remoter parts from the Congregation. Nay, if now-a-days, as lately Sectaries should prevail so far as to possess themselves of all the Publick and Lawful places of Worship, and eject the true Church, they might stand no less legally and Really Excommunicate than if they were thrust formally from thence themselves. For tis not the place, but the Cause, and the Body from which they are cut, that makes the Excommunication just and valid. This we are confirmed in by the same Apostle afterward. *And if any man obey not our word by this Epistle, note that man, and have no company with him, that he may be ashamed.* <sup>2 Thes. 3. 14.</sup> Now St. Paul in this Epistle, had delivered many things not essential in themselves to salvation: And where the company of Christians was not great, and their

Num. 16. 261



Rom. 16. 17.

society not formed, and their outward power little or nothing, as in the beginning of all Churches, there it sufficed in lieu of Formal excommunication, to withdraw themselves from such troublers of the Church. And this we read further of in St. *Paul* to the Romans, saying, *Now I beseech you brethren, mark them which cause Divisions and offences contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned, and avoid them.* St. *Paul* generally in his Epistles not only insists upon unity of Faith but unity of Charity, and outward communion: they therefore that were Authors of unnecessary divisions are they whom he would have noted and avoided, which when it is done with Publick consent, and sentence is the same in effect with Excommunication: and therefore breeders of separation, and divisions are no less subject to excommunications than are Hereticks, though they hold nothing directly contrary to the Faith. But if men will say that, What St. *Paul* did, we may do, and no more, because he did no more, this is invented only to destroy, but will not hold strong enough: because the examples of the Governours of the Church our Rules, are not to be restrained to the very same Cases only, but to them of like general nature. St. *Paul* justifies by his practice the excluding out of the communion of the Church such as bred causeless contentions and divisions and from hence the succeeding Governours are justified in doing the like.

For, nothing can be said less to the question in hand than to recite many places out of St. *Paul* commanding to bear one anothers burdens, and that we should not judge one another; and that the strong should bear with the weak; and such like. For all these Texts speak either of Churches not Formed or constituted, but rather breeding; or of single persons amongst themselves coming to Christian Religion with the strong prepossessions of the Excellency of certain Rites before Religiously observed; wherein all Reason, Justice, and Religion require that no man should impose his conceit upon another, without authority. But do we find in any place of the Holy Scriptures that St. *Paul* denied this Right of Judging, censuring, and commanding, to the whole Church? Nothing less, yea nothing more than the contrary, as may more fully appear when we are to speak of Rites and Ceremonies.

But it is commonly (and as they think accurately) said, that they are the Authors of divisions and Schisms, who will not do what they may to prevent them. And therefore, if Governours impose more then is necessary to salvation, or Faith, upon others, they must answer for the divisions arising from this.

I may marvel, who before late years, (I may say rather dayes) ever understood the Scriptures in this manner? but they will wonder perhaps again, I should think they are no better interpreters and appliers of Scriptures than are to be found in times and societies of old. Let that pass; But so must not their mistake, either of the power of the Church, or the nature of Charity, and common Justice. The power of the Church being meerly ministerial and servile as to Christ, and the Rule of all Christianity, the Scripture; but Magisterial in relation to inferiour members, extendeth only to things of Christian Prudence, and extrinsecal to Faith; and the things uncommanded in Scripture properly (For in other things it is determined without any power to vary from thence;) this done, utterly destroyes all Right and Authority, as to outward matters: which they can never themselves approve of, in the practise, nor have done. But this is not all: for we say, that those Governours are not the cause of Divisions and Schisms

Schifins who do not suspend and withdraw all Injunctions extrinsecal to Faith, or good life, but they rather who do not receive and obey such as are not contrary to either. This is the state of the controversie then between us; supposing there is Order and Legitimate authority constituted amongst us, whether this is more, or so much bound for peace, and unity sake, to gratifie such as are in their rank, subject in the Lord to them in all things possible, according to the Scripture: or these, on the contrary, are obliged to receive and observe all such decrees and constitutions which are indeed much accused and traduced, but cannot be proved to be any wayes contrary to the word of God, or any Analogy of Faith, which is not devised by themselves. And granting there were somewhat of Charity in relaxing of the rigour of Orders to be observed; is there not much more of Charity to be expected from them in obeying? How can they so vehemently urge that upon others, which they are much more bound to keep and practise themselves, but never regard it? Does not Charity much more bind them to obey their Superiours, then their Superiours, them? Nay, can they lay any claim to a thing upon the account of Charity, who deny the same thing upon the account of Justice? Justice, and a debt of obedience flowing from subjection, requires no less than Charity, a compliance of the Wills of the Inferiour with that of the Superiour: But only Charity can be pretended, and that only pretended, where there seems to be an indifference in the thing commanded. For if they betake themselves to the inward temper and bent of particular consciences opposing or approving things, they must needs come off Loosers by such trials. For there will soon be found consciences, on the contrary, that will be as stiff and resolute for the defense, as theirs are for the abrogations of such indifferent things. No reason is possible to be given, why one conscience may not think as well of them, finding them not forbidden; as another doth, evil, finding them not commanded. For the too vulgar doctrine which teacheth, That what is not commanded is forbidden in Scripture, is as notorious a falsity as any thing can be pretended upon the Scripture. But farther, we absolutely declare against all such tryals of Publick Laws and Customes; as Particular: and especially private consciences; as unjust and unreasonable and in truth intollerable, in all Churches. This is the Rule we maintain and hold to, That nothing ought to be ordained or imposed which may justly offend the conscience, and that is only evil. If therefore, the thing it self be acknowledged, or may reasonably be proved to contain nothing sinfull, (which only may offend the conscience) it is one of those evils which cannot be avoided; and such of which Christ speaketh in the Gospel of St. Luke, *It is impossible but that offences will come.* For, either the dissenting, or Assenting conscience must suffer: and which should in such cases suffer who should determine, but Authority? Was ever that chosen for a Rule which is infinite in uncertainties? So are mens consciences in particular. But still they are Instant and say, We grant such things may be left undone without prejudice to the Faith. And to the same argument we return the same answer in effect as before, *viz.* And they grant, they may be done without prejudice to the Faith. But their Case is little less than ridiculous, if it be truly considered what they lay down, and what they crave at our hands. For Peace sake (say they) we ought to yield what is not unlawful; and all indifferent things: As if they much more were not so bound to do. But that we now add is, That there being two Parties diversly constituted, yet, as 'tis supposed, differing only in things of a middle nature between

Luk. 17. 1.

between Good and Evil. If the one Partie should come unto the other promising to have peace, and be at unity with it, on condition that it would yield all things that they may possibly, to them; were this any more than to say, They would be at peace and unity with them when they became of their mind, did as they would have them, and not differ from them? But I have transgressed I fear on this subject, here at present; which yet is not impertinent altogether, it proving that it is Lawful to Excommunicate such who agree with us in Faith. And the summ of the reason is this, *viz.* Because there are, as hath been acknowledged on both sides, yea is almost on all sides granted, two things essential to the Church, Doctrine, and Government, or Discipline, as it is called; to act any thing to the violation of either of these, may justly subject a man to this Ecclesiastical Censure. And however at first sight dissension and opposition to the Rites and practices of a Church may not appear of a mortal nature of themselves, as being perhaps about things in nature alterable, yet in the consequence making a breach in the wall of the City of God, they let in certain ruine and destruction; Thieves and Robbers.

And this holds no less to the Justification of the Church in Excommunicating refractory and disobedient persons to the Church in her citations: though in truth, the ground of her citation be matter of small moment. It were indeed much to be wish'd, that such severe sentences might not be executed but on occasions of greatest moment, not only for the persons sake so excluded, but the Churches sake, denouncing: whose authority must needs be much weakened, and her sentence much condemned, when upon matters appearing merely trivial and light, it is inflicted: And therefore most useful it seemeth, That redress of pecuniary pretensions on persons relating to Ecclesiastical Courts should not be by Excommunication, but from the Civil Power enabling the Ecclesiastical to exact their dues. But where this is not in use, and where no other means appears of obliging men to reverence and submit to Ecclesiastical Powers, but the punishment Ecclesiastical; I would fain have such persons, who profess not the utter abolition of such authority and dissolution, propound some other effectual way of keeping up the power and authority of those Courts, besides Excommunication, before they declare so smartly against the abuse of it. Lastly, whosoever doth by contempt and disobedience first deny the Churches power and in very deed sever himself from it, can he, or any man of Christian reason or modesty contradict the Churches Act in declaring and formally manifesting what was more closely, but really before done by himself? So far as a man disobeyes and opposes the Church, so far is he really separated from it. And to be partly on, and partly off, as some men propound to themselves and please themselves in, thinking it free to choose and leave at their pleasure what their private judgements shall lead them to, is not at all to clear them from the guilt or imputation of Schismaticalness; For all proper Schismatics agree in many things with the Church which they trouble and divide. And every Schismatick stands divided from the Church. And may not the censure of the Church by Excommunication most reasonably at least follow a mans own Act; and declare that to be so which himself hath made so; especially not only thereby, or so much punishing the Offendor as, securing the innocent and sound by such notice from the like contagion? Doth not St. Paul clearly imply so much, when he saith to the Gallatians, *I would they were even cut off that trouble you?* How did these intruders and seducers so trouble the Church as to deserve such



such Excision or Cutting off? By two things principally, one whereof follows in the next verse, by a presumption of such Christian Liberty which was never intended by Christ for his Church. Another was in point of doctrine, innovating rather in form than words. For it was not another doctrine of the Gospel that was offered to these green and unstable Christians, but another Form, the easier to prevail upon their Consciences, and to alienate them from their true Pastors. Such as these would the Apostle have Cut off: and therefore very false and frivolous is that ground of *Socinian* Extract, mentioned in the beginning, *viz.* That nothing which in it self hinders not salvation, can give just occasion of Excommunication.

Gal. 1. 6, 7?

I do not here (as many) insist much upon the words of Christ in St. *Matthew*, whereby he warrants a man to account him, as Heathen and publican, who shall refuse to hear the Church arbitrating, and judging within it self; because I am of their opinion who expound this not of excommunication from the Church, but of a freedom granted to a man to go to the humane Civil Power, for justice against such a brother, as if he were no better than a Heathen and Publican, who will not listen to the voice and judgement of the Church. Yet surely this intimates a power in the Church to determine, and a duty in the members of it, to submit unto the Judgement of it: and if a private man may treat one of his brethren as he would a heathen, in some cases, may not the Church? This is the least we can honestly make of Christs Charter given to the Church by St. *Peter*, in the same Gospel, *I will give unto thee the keys of the Kingdom of heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven.*

Math. 18. 15, 16, 17:

Mat. 16. 19

But consideration and limitation of this grievous censure is not to be omitted, according to diversity of Persons, Relations, and the Causes given; from whence I suppose arose the distinction of *Major* and *Minor* or *Greater* and *Lesser* Excommunication, of ancient use in the Church. And *Anathema* and Excommunication according to the Ancient differ. For, Excommunication is nothing else but a denunciation of a person alienated from the Communion of the Church, in the mysteries and worship proper to Christians: And this we may take to be the Lesser Excommunication: but *Anathema*, or the Greater Excommunication, besides excluding from Christian Communion, added a Curse corporal, which the Scripture calls properly, *a Delivering unto Satan*, as well for the destruction of Body as Soul. Thus was that incestuous person excommunicated by St. *Paul*: For the destruction of the flesh, that the Spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus Christ. For though we say, that this *Anathema* was to the destruction of the flesh, we mean only Actually, as in that state: but the end of that was rather the Salvation of it; by such outward judgements reducing the offender to repentance. This *Anathema* upon the body by plaguing it, being miraculously inflicted, hath ceased. But yet not all bodily punishments with it, taking here bodily punishments, not only for bodily pains, but bodily and outward losses. Of this sort may be those separate men from all Civil Communion with Christians, denying them all outward conversation, as well as spiritual, in matters of Religion. Now this seems to be a branch of the Old Greater Excommunication, and not in all places disus'd. And sometimes is unlawful, and otherwhile lawful, according to the extent and application of them. For, to inflict the same to the dissolving of ties of nature, is not agreeable

1 Cor. 5. 5:

to

to the simplicity of the Gospel. And Natural Ties we call such as are between Subjects and Sovereign, Parents and Children, Husband and Wife, which by no Ecclesiastical Excommunication can be broken or nulled: The reason whereof, besides the monstrous effects ensuing upon their evacuation, not here to be treated of, is this, That Ecclesiastical Power can take away no more than it gave; nor Christianity destroy what it never builded. But Christianity did never simply confer such Rights on men, but the Law of Nature; only it regulated and directed the same, therefore can it not null it: It is therefore unchristian, for any pretending Ecclesiastical Power, to absolve subjects from obedience Civil, or Children from natural, and the like. But every Christian in that he is adopted of God by baptism, and admitted into the Society of Christians, doth receive thereby certain Rights and power to communicate with it in all things: which power may be forfeited and lost by breach of Covenant, as well with the Body of the Church, to live and believe according to the Received Faith and practice thereof, as with the Head Christ. And this being so judged by those who are over the Church in the Lord, it is very consonant to Christian Religion, to deny such, of what order or rank soever they be, the signs of outward communion, Prayer and Communication of the Holy Sacraments of Christ. The Church hath power to declare even sovereign Princes incapable of such Communion, and deny it them: which we call the Lesser Excommunication. Yet because (as we said) No natural Right can be extinguished, upon unchristian misdemeanours, If a Supream Prince of a Place should disdain to be denied or opposed in such cases, and would make his entrance into the Church by virtue of his Civil Right to all places under his Dominion, the most that the Church could do, justly in such cases, were to disswade him, but by any force to resist his entrance into any Church, were unlawful; as it would be also to minister in a Christian manner in his presence: for this cannot be commanded by him: but in such cases suffering must be put in practice, as for the Faith it self sought to be destroyed.

Some there are yet who call in question the peculiar and incommunicable Right of decreeing this Censure of Excommunication, to those called the Clergy: which is very strange, seeing this Power is part of that of the Keys delivered by Christ himself to such only as he constituted Governors of the Church; and that in Christs days their was a distinction between the Members of his Body, as to Inferiority and Superiority; Obedience, and Command; Teacher, and Learner; and much more in the Apostles days, after Christs Assention; and much more yet, after their days, according as the matter of the Church (Christians encreasing and improving) became more capable of a more convenient form and fashion. For as it is in the production of natural things, though the Form be certain and constant, and the very same at the first production, as in its perfection, yet it doth not appear so fully and perfectly as afterward: So was it with the Body of Christs Church: It is certain therefore, that from the beginning, this Act of Excluding from the Communion was never executed but by the Rulers and Presidents of Congregations, though the people might concurr thereto. Now that these Rulers whom we may call Bishops or Presbyters were not created by the People, nor by the Prince, we have shewed already, and therefore did nothing in their Right, but in the Power of Christ whose Ministers alone they properly were: And this being essential to right Administration of the Church, how can it be supposed either to be

be separable from the Church in General, or from those persons who are the proper Administrators of it. For to say with some, It is needless wholly where Christian Magistrates rule, whose proper office it is to rebuke and punish vice, and scandalous misdemeanors; which, say they, can only be just cause of Excommunication; is to destroy the subject of the question, which supposes it needful, and upon this, enquires after the Persons which should Execute the same. And spitefully to defeat the Church of all Authority from Christ; doth indeed translate this Power to the Civil Magistrate. And is not the absurdity the very same which endows the Christian Governor with Civil Power, and which endows the Civil Magistrate with Christian? If it be not absurd for a King to be a Philosopher, it is not absurd for a Philosopher to be a King. If it be not absurd for a Civil Magistrate to have Priestly power, it is not absurd for him that hath Priestly power to be a Magistrate. There is certainly no inconsistency on either side: For things of a far different nature and intention may easily meet in the same person, though the things themselves can never be the same. Here therefore, the things differing so egregiously, it is no more than necessary that a different cause be acknowledged necessary, which not appearing, the Effect must be denied. Now the Cause of all Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction as Ecclesiastical, must needs come from him, from whom the Church itself hath its Original and being: And it is a certain Rule that a man is born to nothing, that comes from Christ as Head of his Church, but is made and instituted. Which whoever is not, cannot lay any just claim to any Office under him.

*Selden de Jure  
Gentium apud  
Bibliander  
apud Eraſmum;*

I know it is objected, that Preaching being an Ecclesiastical Act, hath without contradiction been practised by diverse, and to this day may be, no ordination preceeding. To which I thus answer, by distinguishing first between doing a thing *Ex Charitate* and *Ex Officio*, out of Charity and out of duty. Preaching was ever permitted in the Church (especially taken in the larger sense wherein it signifies all declaration of the Gospel) out of Charity: But the office of Preaching was never suffered, but upon antecedent qualifications. And these two differ yet farther: For he that doth a thing out of Office, doth it so that it is not lawful for him absolutely to omit it: but he that doth it out of Charity and only by connivance, not by commission, may cease at his pleasure, and as he made, may suspend himself when he will. Again, he that teaches without Authority upon bare permission, may be silenced without any other cause rendered, but the will of him that hath the Jurisdiction: or if a reason be given, because, He hath no authority, is sufficient. But he that is orderly instituted to that end, cannot without injustice and Tyranny be denied the exercise of that which pertains to him.

Now the Key of Knowledge and the Key of Jurisdiction, of which the Power of the Keys delivered by Christ consists, and into which it is commonly divided, are very different. For the first doth but open the door to the others, and prepares and qualifies a person for the other, but doth no more actually give power or authority, than the great skill and experience of a Souldier makes him a Captain, to command others: or knowledge in the law, makes a man a judge actually. It is therefore the Key of Jurisdiction or a Right given by Christ to administer the Church, and every member thereof, that is principally to be acknowledged in this Case: And which not being found to descend orderly from Christ, no effect of that affected power can be acknowledged. But, as is said, doth not descend



pend naturally, or by birth, but Judicially, from others. In which manner who ever receives it not, sacrilegiously usurps what belongs not to him.

Selden de Synedriis: Lib. 1. Cap. 9.

But they who would wring this power out of the hands of the Church, do give us certain Presidents as well from the Jewish Church, wherein there was (it should seem) a custom that one Person might excommunicate another, when he pleased. But the same Antiquaries tell us also, that it was in use amongst them for a man to excommunicate himself. And this I take to imply an answer to the former. For it is in the power of any man to separate himself from the Church, or any other Society *materially*, and *Really*: but Judicially, and Formally, he cannot: neither can he separate another, otherwise than by absenting himself from the Communion of the Church: he may, indeed, as formally pronounce such a censure against himself, or another as the most Canonical Judge in the world; but intrinsic power being wanting, the outward Act turns to smokes, as to others; but as to himself, has no other effect then he that is in a boat hath upon the earth against which he sets his oar, and thrusts hard, but puts himself off, not the earth: as our neighbouring Ministers did when with intollerable and incredible presumption, they took upon them to Excommunicate their own Bishops; and some of the transmarine Churches of the same Platform, were so wise as to allow their Fact.

Id. *ibid.*

Suidas in  
Ἐκκλησιαστικῇ  
ἱστορίᾳ. Ἐκκομ-  
μουνισμός.

And to the Instances of some Princes whom Histories affirm to have Excommunicated certain persons; the Answer is, That the word *Excommunication* hath deceived the reporters and appliers thereof to this Case: For according to signification of that word, both in the Latin and Greek language, Excommunication or ἀποκλήσις is the declaration by Publick Herald of any guilty Person to be excluded, or banished the Princes Court or Company, or perhaps Dominions: Thus many have been Excommunicated by Sovereign Princes. But can any instances be given of such as without any further Act of the Church, have been thereupon denied Communion with the Church.

And what we say of Excommunicating, holds good likewise in the Power of Absolution: which the same Persons allow to meer secular Powers; and would prove from an Act of *Constantine* the Great his absolving *Eusebius* Bishop of *Nicomedia*. *Constantine* (we all know) had but little knowledge in the Rites of the Church, at that time, and might attempt he knew not what, as soon as any other man, whose affection to Christianity far exceeded his Judgement: But what is affirmed of *Constantines* Act? That he Restored that Excommunicated person to the Communion of the Church: (which only is properly Absolution) No surely, but he might restore him to his See, and that is all: Or if more were done, he might be said to do it, who caused, by the interposition of his Power, some Bishop of the Church to free him from those Bonds.

But questionless that is none of the least corruptions which the Church of Rome stands guilty of, and which our Church hath but too much connived at, that the Power of Excommunication should be in the hands of Lay men. To mend this a little, they of the Roman Law, distinguish that which by no means should be separated, curing one absurdity by another: For they distinguish Episcopal Order, from Episcopal Jurisdiction: and say a man that hath not Episcopal Order, but Episcopal Jurisdiction, may Excommunicate: a vile and corrupt imagination brought in on purpose to serve the turns of ambitious, secular, and sacrilegious *Drones* who would

Annasimus  
Germinius de  
Sacrorum Im-  
munitat.

would drive two trades, of secular advantage, and Ecclesiastical Profits. For there is nothing so Essential unto Episcopacy as Jurisdiction (I mean an Habitue and Right to Preside and Rule,) and there can be no Episcopal power without that; nor that without Episcopal Character: Officers indeed there may be under him, void of that Character or any Priestly: because though the Court be properly Ecclesiastical, yet all things are not so which are acted therein. Judicial Acts, and Acts of Notaries and of Executions are competent to unordain'd persons, because Gifts of nature and Learning may capacitate a man to them: but that of Jurisdiction properly so called, is the intrinsique Right of the Pastour of the Church: and this of Excommunication annexed thereunto, or rather a part of it. And therefore, he is not a Bishop, that hath it not, and he that hath it, is a Bishop. It is not indeed necessary that this should be denounced by a Bishop, but that this power which is likewise inherent in a Priest as a Priest, be committed to him, after the decree made by the Bishop. For the Priest having a Jurisdiction within himself, by vertue of his place and office, but restrained by the Superiour Power to him; the Jurisdiction and Authority of the Bishop is seen sufficiently in this, that it enables a Priest to do that which of himself he ought not to do: and this is rather exciting an old power in the Priest, then infusing a new, giving right to it to exert it self which before it had not. But Lay-men having no Ecclesiastical Character inherent in them, cannot by any such general commission given them from the Bishop, act effectually to that end for want of the due Principle: this Licence of the Bishop being nothing else, but removing of that Obstacle which hinders it to work where it was. For to deliberate, debate, and Judge of causes and persons subject to Excommunication, may possibly be better performed by such who have attained to that science, without any order in the Clergy, but the fact it self is quite of another nature.

## CHAP. XXXIII.

*Of the second branch of Ecclesiastical Power, which is Mystical, or Sacramental. Hence of the Nature of Sacraments in General. Of the Vertue of the Sacraments. Of the sign and thing signified. That they are alwayes necessarily distinct. Intention how necessarie to a Sacrament. Sacraments Effectual to Grace.*

**H**AVING thus spoken of the Political Power of the Church, which we so call because it imitates that which is so more properly called in directing the visible Body of the Church to its proper end, as the Pilot doth the ship to its proper Haven, and hath both Visible Acts and Effects; We are now to treat of that Power, We, in distinction to that other, do call Mystical: because the End and Effect thereof is not outward or visible: but inward, spiritual, and Mysterious: and therefore also call it Sacramental, Sacrament and Mystery being the same in the Original Phrase of the New Testament. For to the Church, as they are more peculiarly called, who are Officers in the same, doth it, of Right, appertain to celebrate these Mysteries. Wherefore, first we shall speak of the Sacraments in General, as the manner is, and then in Particular.

The word Sacrament is rather of Gentile than Christian original, there being no word in the New Testament proper to it, but the vulgar Translation thinking fit to render *Mystery, Sacrament*, in Latin, the Antienter Latin Church hath made use of it to expresse certain Mysterious Rites of sacred and necessary use in the Church of God: about which word so long since received, no contention ought to be had. The Nature, Number, Minister and Use of them deserving principal enquiry.

A Sacrament is defin'd (as is commonly known) by St. *Augustine*, a *Visible sign of an Invisible Grace*, which being taken rigorously, seemeth not to comprehend the whole nature of it: therefore *Antissiodorensis* would have its defect supplied, thus. *A Sacrament is a visible form of an Invisible Grace, whereof it is also the Cause.* But considering the many and sharp disputes upon this subject, I suppose it may be more fully described to be *A visible sign ordained by God to produce an invisible effect of Grace in the soul of Man.* This definition may be collected from the several parts of it, contained in the word of God: as first, from St. *Paul* to the Romans speaking of Circumcision, a prime Sacrament given by God to *Abraham* and his seed. *And he received the sign of Circumcision a Seal of the Righteousness of Faith which he had being yet uncircumcised.* For there are three special properties of a Sacrament commonly acknowledged, To *Signifie*, To *Seal*, To *Effect* Grace: but in strickness of speech these make but two Acts. For, either a Thing doth barely signify and declare another, or it concurrereth

to

Sacramentum  
est invisibilis  
gratiae invisibilis  
forma; ita ut ejus, similitudinem  
gerat, et causa  
existat.  
*Gulielmus Antissiodorensis.*  
Sum. Lib. 4.  
Cap. 1.

Rom. 4. 11.



to the being of another, where things are Related one to another. For seals are no more than signs binding more firmly to the fulfilling of the contents of an Instrument or Conveyance. For as in such Cases, the Free good will of the Donour, is the only cause of an inheritance given; the Instrument of Conveyance consisting of so many words are the signs of the inward will, the seals are but signs of the signs of words, that is, an assurance that what was signified in the said Instrument, should hold good. And the Actual Delivery of this is the immediate Cause of entering into possession or enjoyment of this Gift. In like manner, The word of God promising his Graces to us, signifies the will of God to that end: The Sacraments superadded do likewise sensibly signifie unto us the earnest God is in, when he made promises unto us, as Seals. And the actual exhibiting of these signs or seals on Gods Part by his Proxy or Ministers, and the due receiving of them on our Part, do put us into a fruition of those things which were so signified and promised. First then, They must be a sign, that is, a Representation of a thing and not the thing it self, and that to add to our knowledge and Faith: for if there were no agreement between the thing signifying, and the thing signified, the word of God alone had sufficed to that end. Secondly, they must be ordained of God, For if no man, in common justice, can give away another mans estate, but the true owner of it; how should it be possible, or equal, or credible, that any other besides God himself the Owner of his graces, should by instruments of his own forging convey such heavenly benefits to mankind, which properly belong to God; This were supream folly and presumption to attempt. Or can any man know Gods mind or methods of working before he hath revealed them? Therefore it is said that God gave *Abraham* the Sign and Seal of Circumcision. Thirdly, they must rather be ordained Arbitrarily of God, and by special Institution, then Naturally; least the Free Grace of God therein contained should suffer, and the effect be ascribed rather to natural than supernatural Causes. For though the cutting off of the foreskin of the flesh, by explication, intimate the cutting off of the filth of the Soul: yet naturally it could not be so well understood: And God might, if he had pleased, ordained the cutting off of the tip of the ear, to serve the same ends. And so in baptism, Water doth naturally cleanse bodily filthiness, but without notice given of Gods will and grace, it could never have been believed possible to affect the soul, and purify it. Fourthly, as there must be some agreement between the thing signifying and signified, there must also be a real difference in their nature. For nothing in nature or reason can signify it self, because nothing can be clearer than it self: For when a thing is obvious to our senses or otherwise apparent we do not say, *we have a sign of such a thing*; but the thing it self. Yet this most certain Rule is sought to be baffled, and overthrown by Cavillers; who would bring in their false doctrine of the Eucharist, and would shew from bread on a Stall or Cloath which signifies bread and Cloath as well as is bread and Cloath, that the same body of Christ may be a sign of it self. But their attempts in their Instance fail them because that Bread which is exposed to be sold, or that Cloath, is not a sign of it self, *viz.* That it is cloath or bread; but is so only: but it is only a sign that either it is to be sold, which is quite another thing from Cloath it self, or it is a sign of other cloath which doth not appear. And so the body of Christ in the Eucharist is not a sign of that Body which doth appear, but of that which doth not appear. And therefore, a Fifth condition of a Sacrament is, That it

should

Sicut Signum  
et res ipsa a-  
liquando  
possint esse  
diversa, ita  
sæpenumero  
et in multis  
eadem esse  
possunt: Tun-  
stal. 9. de Eu-  
charistia fol:  
16.

should *visibly* signify something invisible and spiritual. Lastly that Sacraments are to be not only significant, or (which comes to the same) Sealing; but efficacious in themselves upon the souls of men: which may deserve further explication.

A thing may be said in its self efficacious, though it doth not attain the proper end of its working; it misses of its effect, because the conditions required are not kept. For fire it self, as active and operative an Element as it is, doth not work effectually upon any thing but its proper matter, nor upon that, at too great a distance. So may it be with the Sacraments, which though indeed they are the power of God, and not of nature, unto salvation, yet through some defect in the object, or indisposition, may fail of their proper and wonted Effect: but not from any insufficiency in themselves, or indignity of the Minister of them.

For, if in this sense that old barbarous Rule be taken, *viz.* That Sacraments have their virtue *Ex Opere Operato*, *viz.* From the work done *i. e.* that they are Efficacious means of Grace in themselves, and their vertue doth not depend upon the Ministers unworthiness or worthiness, provided he doth work according to Christs institution and intention, it is true: For what St. *Paul* speaks of the Ministers of the Gospel, is true of the Ministers of the Sacraments, *Not that we are sufficient of our selves to think any thing as of our selves, but our sufficiency is of God.* The Officers of God in the delivering of these means of salvation not swerving from the Rule and Prescription given by God, these Instruments themselves have their due and proper effect. As when a King of his Free Grace sendeth by a leud and vain fellow a Grant of some great Favour to any of his subjects, whom he pleaseth to raise out of a poor and base estate to riches and honour, 'tis not the unworthiness or wickedness of the bearer, so long as he is true in his Office, that can void the Grant, so neither can the evil manners of the Ministers of the word and Sacraments, null the power and promises of God made in them.

But though evil manners and vitiousness of the person do not corrupt or destroy the nature and end of the Sacrament, yet it is believed that the actual averstation of the mind of him who consecrates and administers, not only not intending actually to Consecrate, but actually intending not to consecrate, may evacuate the whole Action. But this is shown by the former example to be very false, because still God hath inserted his will, and annexed his promises to the thing it self, and not to the Persons disposition or indisposition either of understanding, or manners. It is true, some of the Antients have said that Intention is necessary to a Sacrament, and this hath given occasion to that gross Error in the Church of Rome; which hath mistaken the intention of such Fathers as have spoken of Intention. For Intention is twofold: The Intention of Christ or God, and the Intention of Man or the Minister; They may say that Intention is necessary to a Sacrament taking their Intention for the will and mind of God: which if it be not observed in all necessary things (at least the Sacrament) is not perfect or valid: but if it be, whatever mans intention be, it hinders not, the Sacrament is the same. And whereas they would soften this harsh, and moderate this erroneous doctrine, by distinguishing of Intention in the Priest, into *Actual, Habitual, and Virtual*: First, we may well except against this distinction it self, because they are forced in the explication of it to make Habitual and Virtual Intention the same, in all material things, only they cause them to differ, in that, Habitual is only a general intention without

out any actual consideration at the time of Consecration, of what they are about. Vertual, that there is at the entrance upon that Action, an actual purpose to do what Christ and the Church intended should be done, at that time; but this passeth away suddenly, and all the remaining Action is performed by vertue of that first good thought. But this cannot serve the turn; For the form of the Sacrament consisting chiefly in the words of Consecration, according to their own doctrine, if such an Intention be wanting at that time, there can be no consecration, and if no consecration, no Sacrament. So that there are two notorious inconveniences following upon this Error; the one, that the most sacred and Comfortable Instruments of Gods Grace and our Salvation are left to the lusts of malicious and vain man to be baffled at his pleasure, and the Communicant defeated of the blessings God hath consigned to him thereby. Another that upon supposition that the Sacraments were duly administered, and so by consequence effectual to their proper ends; yet this being not certainly known to the Partaker thereof, his mind must be in perpetual disturbance and conflict, fearing that the Priest had an inward intention contrary to the outward appearance. But they say, there is at least a Moral certainty. And what is a Moral certainty? Can they tell? They have not yet. And all I suppose they can say is no more then to make it a good degree of Probability; which will not serve this Case. But in truth, many Cases fall out so that there is that they call a *Moral Certainty* on the contrary: when spite and malice boil high in the breasts of men, and their happiness consists in doing all the mischief they can to them they malign, which we know by several Instances, is not seldom found in those Countreys where this doctrine flourishes most: And to what they are wont here chiefly to oppose; That there can be no probability of an effect where the cause is not real but jocular, ludicrous, and Histrionical (as it must be where there is no intention but only a fiction of doing a thing) as if one in mockery, upon the Stage, should baptize one, in derision of the Faith and Church of Christ: We answer, That if this Ludicrous Action be so fictitious, and false that the thing only seems to be done, but is not done; and one seems to be baptized, but is not: It matters not what his intention may be: For we now suppose the thing to be done as Christ and the Church intends. For if this be wanting, surely nothing is really performed: But the question is whether when the thing is really done, saving the due intention, this defect voids all the rest. For let an Officer of a King mock what he pleases, and act what he pleases in scorn and derision of the thing he hath in Charge to deliver, and declare it is contrary to his resolution to deliver it, yet if he really doth deliver it, his contrary purposes and actions cannot hinder the effect, nor the benefit accruing from thence. For as St. Paul saith, *Neither he that planteth is any thing, nor he that watereth is any thing, but God who giveth the increase.* We see this in marriage more apparently than in other Sacraments (if we may call this a sacrament, of which by and by) that, let the Minister intend what he pleases, nay the Parties Jest with that Sacred Rite never so lightly, if there be a performance of such things as are outwardly required to that solemnity, it holds good to all intents and purposes, even against the resolutions of the persons principally concerned therein. Yet must we acknowledge a vast difference between those two most properly called Sacraments: Baptism, and the supper of the Lord. For undoubtedly; where in either of these there is a repugnancy of the will to them,

1 Cor. 3. 7.



them, their effect is nothing upon the person receiving them: because this is the principal obstacle of all to the efficacy, yet is the Sacrament never the less valid, and truly performed as to the Nature of it.

And concerning the *Efficacy* of the Sacraments it is worth our enquiry; especially for their sakes who ascribing very injudiciously and injuriously, the Grace of Sanctification and Justification absolutely to a special Faith, thought of but lately amongst Christians; or to the unfearchable Decree of Almighty God, to justify and save such persons as are ordained to Life and Salvation, affirm this Decree and good purpose of God to effect all things necessary to salvation; and that the Sacraments are received only as so many pledges and seals of the good will of God in our Justification and Salvation, long before concluded immutably towards us; but are of no efficacy, or vertue to bring them about. This, though Calvin, Cartwright, Perkins, plainly and directly asserted by some eminent Reformers, is no better than a pestilent Error; contrary to all Antiquity of Ecclesiastical and Scriptural Writers: Of which latter, it suffices to instance in those obvious places which directly infer a necessity of them, and ascribe a vertue to them, of effecting, and not only signifying Grace, or sealing it unto us. For *Matthew* the 3. v. 11. *St. John* distinguishing his Baptism from the Baptism of Christ, assureth, that Christ should Baptize with the Holy Ghost, and not only with Water. Now if water alone signifies, or seals (for there is no such great difference between these as commonly is supposed) and therefore the Baptism that Christ used having more in it than so, it follows that it must be the efficacy and grace of the Holy Spirit. And they, who take notice of this argument to answer, that the difference between *Johns* Baptism and that of Christ here prophesied of, consists in this, That *Johns* was an outward washing, Christs an inward, doth confirm what I said: For surely this inward, being invisible, can be no outward sign or seal, whose natures are to be visible and apparent. And therefore it must be that Baptism of Grace wrought in the inward man. And doth Mark. 16. 16. Christ when he saith, *Mark* 16. 16. *He that believeth, and is Baptized, shall be saved*, doth he mean no more than, *It is a sign he shall be saved*? Or he hath his salvation, which came onely by believing sealed unto him? Or are they not rather lequally conjoynd to the same effect, Salvation? So that no more can a man expect to be saved by believing without being Baptized, than he can by being Baptized without believing. And this is manifest from the Baptism of Infants, which puts tham into a state of salvation, even before actual faith in them.

John. 3. 5. Again, Being born of Water and the Holy Ghost, of which Christ speaks in *St. John* (meaning thereby Baptism) must needs be more than certain indications and signs of life. Christ sayes there expressly, we are *born by Water*, and not that we are *known* to be born by Water only. And where as *Calvin* with diverse followers of the Reformation, presume to interpret this *Water*, as elsewhere *Fire*, of the Holy Ghost, and not of the proper Element Water; I make no scruple to accuse them of extreme insolence for so doing; as well, because they needlessly, and more immodestly oppose the unanimous consent of the Ancient Interpreters expounding it of Water-Baptism, than I do contradict them, whom I alwayes set in a lower form to them: as also, because the thing it self declares the contrary sense to be more agreeable to the mind of the Holy Ghost. For, Water and the Holy Ghost are put here, not *exegetically* (as they speak) but distinctly as two several things concurring to the same end. For, though

*John*

*John* in *St. Matthew* addeth to the *Holy Ghost, Fire*, as *Water* is in *S. John*, seeing there is found a real and proper verification of this baptism of fire which was at the day of *Pentecost*, when the Apostles and Disciples were visited with fiery Tongues from above, there is no necessity of fleeing to a meer metaphor: and if there be none here, there is none in that place where water is joyned with the *Holy Ghost*: And reading no where, that even the *Holy Ghost* appeared in the likeness of water, we are constrained to take this properly, of external water.

Furthermore, when an effect is ascribed to a thing, why should we make doubt to ascribe an efficacy or agencie to that reputed Cause? But to Baptism is ascribed remission of sins, as *Acts 2. 38. Repent ye (saith St. Peter) and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins, &c.* And elsewhere in the *Acts*, God commandeth *St. Paul, Arise and be baptized, and wash away thy sins.* Can any thing but a fond partiality to the new glosses of Modern Divines, incline any man to think otherwise of Baptism here, than of force to take away sins? Here they demand with a Passion, What? *Ex Opere Operato? From the work of Baptism done?* I answer; The work done of it self is not thus efficacious, as is said; but the Co-operation of the *Holy Spirit*, which God hath set over that work, and its influence, effecteth thus much.

Lastly, The Introducers and Defenders of this opinion of the ineffectualness of the Sacraments, allowing an efficacy to excite and nourish Faith, (which with them does all things) why should they be so nice and timorous in granting another effect of the same nature? For to encrease and confirm Faith, being a spiritual effect, is as much in nature, as washing away sins, or communicating new Graces? I see no difference, worth the noting, besides that from themselves; and an illaudable pronity to vary from Tradition expounding holy Writ, where wit and wantonness of Judgment can find the least footing to stand out against Antiquity.

But whereas some argue for the efficaciousness of Baptism, and the other Sacraments out of Reason; and some out of Reason argue against it; it is hard to see how either side can attain their ends; seeing whatever efficacy the Sacraments have, they derive from the Institution of God: which Institution can be no otherwise known to us then from his word, and therefore, as Divine reason proceeding upon Scripture grounds may inform us, we may conclude, and no otherwise: Wherefore they argue very prophane-ly, and according to Scripture grounds, ridiculously, who talk of *Aqua-quula*, a Little water, as if for want of that God should suffer a soul to perish; or for want of a Little morsel of bread, and a drop or two of wine, men should perish everlastingly. As if it were not a mercy of God to save some, and that by the contemptiblest things in the world, and such as his illuminable power and wisdom should choose, rather than rigour in binding us to them; or to be authors of our own ruin. But to protract a disputation to prove that the efficacy of the Sacraments can arise from the Work it self; thinking thereby that it must follow that they are not at all efficacious, as some very learned men have done, is rather to be pitied than persecuted. For no otherwise do we ascribe vertue to them, *Ex opere Operato*, but as it is opposit to *Opus operantis*, meaning that the instrumental things, the Sacraments, have not their sufficiencie or efficiencie from the Instrumental Persons, the Ministers of them, but that these doing the work required of them by the Ordainer, the efficacy follows, and yet not absolutely from the work, but from the will of God.

## CHAP. XXXIV.

*Of the distinction of Sacraments into Legal and Evangelical. Of the Covenants necessary to Sacraments. The true difference between the Old and New Covenant. The Agreement between Christ and Moses. The Agreements and differences between the Law and the Gospel.*

**M**ORE contention hath afflicted the Church of God in the disquisition of the number, than nature of the Sacraments. First then, for methods sake, We shall divide them into *Legal* and *Evangelical*. Legal Sacraments were those outward Signs and Rites which God ordained to *Abraham* and his Seed, as Instances and Notices of the Covenant made between him and them. And therefore it will not be improper nor unseasonable to interrupt a little the immediate prosecution of the Sacraments, and treat of the Covenants God hath made with man, as well New as Old: seeing all the Sacraments, as well Jewish as Christian, relate to those Covenants.

Gen. 31.52.

A Covenant is nothing else but an Agreement solemnly made between two distinct Parties, with Conditions mutually to be observed: as in that between *Laban* and *Jacob*, *That the one should not pass over, that leap to the other for harm.* So likewise between God and Man, a Stipulation and Restipulation is made, that the one should perform the part of a Patron and Lord, and the other of a faithful Servant to him.

This Covenant is but twofold in general, however it be diversified according to the several occasions of revealing the same. The first was properly a Covenant of Nature; the second, of Grace. The Covenant of Nature was first made with *Adam* at his creation, wherein was bestowed on him, not only such Faculties and Perfections of Being as necessarily tended to the natural perfection of man; but super-added certain supernatural Graces which might dispose him with facility to fulfill the Law and Will of God: Notwithstanding which, he disobeying God, forfeited those more special aids and accomplishments, and so dissolved that Covenant.

God proceeded not upon faithless man according to the rigour of his Justice; but out of his free inscrutable favour inclined, to renew a Covenant with him again, and that was in a third Person, not with false man immediately as before. And this Person, through whom he thus covenant a second time with man, was the Man Christ Jesus: and then these three are no more Covenants really. Yet because this second, of sending his Son as a Mediatour between God and Man, had such different Forms and Faces upon



upon it, according to the several Oeconomies or Dispensations it pleased God to make to man, it is often in holy Scripture distinguished into the Old Covenant and the New: As by St. Paul to the *Galatians*, saying; *These two are the two Covenants*—*The one from Mount Sinai; the other from Mount Sion or Jerusalem.* And to the Hebrews; *If the first Covenant had been faultless, then should no place have been found for the second.* Where he spake of the Covenant of Moses, and that of the Gospel. Gal. 4. 24.  
Hebr. 8. 7.

But there was a more early Covenant made with *Abraham*: when God promised to him the Land of *Canaan*, and to his Seed: But both these agree in the same, in that they are termed Covenants of Works: not that they were so made that they only required working, and the second part, believing, which was under the Gospel: For this Covenant made with *Abraham* and *Moses* peculiarly to the Israelites, did suppose the first solemn Covenant of Faith in the promised Seed of the Woman, which should break the Serpents head: And therefore this was not another from that, but as a Codicil annex in order to some special Promises and Privileges made over to the Seed of *Abraham*, upon terms not common to all mankind. Such as were temporal blessings, and particularly the inheritance of the Land of *Canaan*. But that which is often called the New Covenant, or the Covenant of the Gospel, is according to the substance of an ancienter date than that made either with *Abraham* or *Moses*; being the same which was made with *Adam* the second time in Paradise. But is called the New Covenant, because it appeared but newly in respect of its dress and clearer revelation, at Christs appearing: And therefore St. John excellently expresses this, when he seemeth to speak on both sides, saying, *Brethren; I write no new Commandment to you, but an old Commandment, which ye had from the beginning: the old Commandment is the Word which ye have heard from the beginning. Again, a new Commandment I write unto you, which thing is true in him and in you:* signifying unto us in what sense the Gospel was new, and in what, Old. It was new in comparison of the more conspicuous manifestation of it: it was old in respect of its Ordination. For to this end, the Apostle to the *Colossians* speaking of the Gospel, calleth it the *Mystery which hath been hid from ages, and from generations, but now is made manifest to his Saints, &c.* 1 Joh. 2. 7, 8;  
Coloss. 1. 26;

But the nature of this Covenant, and the vulgar confusions made in treating of the Old and New, will more clearly appear from a short consideration of the Agreement and Differences between these two Covenants.

And the first Agreement is that we now have insinuated, that the substance of them both was the same. Secondly, they agree in their Author. For, contrary to some ancient Hereticks, the same God was the Author of the Old, who was Author of the New Law. Thirdly, they agree in the Principal Minister and Mediatour of both, which was Christ Jesus: who is therefore said to be *the same yesterday, to day, and for ever*, because both before the Law, and under the Law, and after the Law of *Moses*, Christ was the same Mediatour. Fourthly, they were one as to their end, which next to the ultimate of All, was the glory of God, was the salvation of the observers of them: obedience unto Gods will being the most immediate. Fifthly, they agree, In that neither of them was immediately given of God, but both in the hand of a Mediatour between God and Man, as the Apostle witnesseth of the Old Law, in his Epistle to the *Galatians*, *It was ordained by Angels in the hands of a Mediatour: Now this Mediatour* Hebr. 13. 8.  
Gal. 3. 19, 20;

is not a Mediatour of one: And of the Gospel, the same Apostle speaketh to the Hebrews, that Jesus was the *Mediatour of a New Covenant*: as was prophesied in *Deuteronomy* by Moses, saying; *The Lord thy God will raise up unto thee a Prophet from the midst of thee, of thy brethren like unto me, unto him ye shall hearken.* And Moses and Christ agreed in that, First, Moses came not of himself, but was sent of God. So also Christ glorified not himself, to be made an High Priest, but he that said unto him, *Thou art my Son, &c.* 2. Neither Moses nor Christ delivered their own will, or sought their own glory, before the glory of him that sent them. For Exodus 25. 40. Moses was commanded to make all things according to the pattern shewed him of God in the Mount. And we find nothing in the Books of Moses more frequent than, *The Lord said unto Moses, &c.* In like manner, Christ saith of himself, *The Word which ye hear is not mine, but the Fathers that sent me.* And elsewhere, *I am come in my Fathers name, &c.* Thirdly, they were both sent immediately of God. Fourthly, Both of them confirmed the Doctrine by Miracles and mighty Signs, proving to the beholders a Divine Power assisting them. For Moses wrought such Miracles as none of the expertest Magicians could: and Christ saith of himself, *If I had not done among them the works that no other man did, they had not had sin.* Thus they may seem to agree.

But their difference is no less: and that, First, if we consider their immediate Authors in their Persons. For Moses was only Man, but Christ God and Man: under which one manifold, other differences are comprehended, as to their conception, birth, life, and death; manner of their office and administration thereof; which I pass over and come to the Laws or Covenants themselves given by Moses and Christ. For then the Law and Covenant in the hand of Christ was more ancient than that given by Moses, as to the substance and foundation, which was the Law of Nature, and Reason, and Justice towards God and Man, and perfect Obedience to the will of God. For the Promise of the Messiah to come, was made to Mankind immediately after Adams transgression, wherein consisted the sum of the Gospel, many hundred of years before Moses his dayes, or Laws: and therefore must be more sacred and necessary. Secondly, The Law as Mosaical was only a type and shadow of good things to come, and not the very things themselves: as the Apostle to the Hebrews argueth. But as it is commonly seen when a man propoundeth to himself to cast a fair Statue, or to build a fair house, he first makes a mold, and prepares convenient tools; So God, out of his wisdom, (however he could have done otherwise) first prepared the Law of Moses, as a Model, according to which he cast the Law of Christ; and made use of the Rites and Ceremonies to prepare the way for the Gospel. And hence ariseth a Third difference, because the Form of Moses his Law was temporary, and to cease, but that of Christ was to have no end, as was prophesied in the Book of the *Psalms*, speaking of the Jewish Politie, Church, and Magistracy, under the Metaphors of Heavens and their host, as is frequent in Scripture, *They shall perish but thou shalt endure, yea all of them shall wax old like a garment, as a vesture shalt thou change them, and they shall be changed: but thou art the same, and thy years shall have no end.* Of Christs Kingdom there shall be no end. Fourthly, The Law and Covenant Mosaical had only temporal Promises of reward and punishments, relating to this Life and the Land of Canaan, called for this cause the *Land of Promise*, unto Abraham and his Seed upon condition of Obedience unto those Laws delivered

Hebr. 12. 24.  
Deut. 18. 15.  
Hebr. 5. 5.  
Exod. 25. 40.  
John 14. 24.  
John 5. 43.  
John 15. 24.  
Hebr. 10. 1.  
Psal. 102. 26, 27.  
Hebr. 1. 10.  
Jer. 32. 40.  
Hebr. 13. 20.  
Daniel 4. 3.  
Psal. 145. 13.

delivered to *Abraham* and *Moses*: As upon due examination of particular instances which may be given, doth appear. For they declare to us that so long as they observed Gods commands, and kept to his worship, they prospered and were happy in secular blessings, but when they forsook them, God forsook them, and they soon perished in their sins. But both the promises and threatnings of the Gospel and New Covenant were spiritual and perpetual, leading unto everlasting Life. For every one, saith Christ, *that hath forsaken houses, or brethren, or sisters, or father, or mother, or wife, or children, for any names sake, shall receive an hundred fold, and shall inherit everlasting Life.* And so Luke 18. v. 30. Yet to judge more clearly of the Mosaical Law, and the better to reconcile both Jewish and Christian interpreters of *Moses* his Law, some whereof make it merely Ceremonial, and concerning in its reward, only temporal blessings or curses (as may be gathered from the blessings and curses enumerated in the Book of *Deuteronomie*, chap. 18.) others affirm it to have contained spiritual blessings, upon obedience, and the contrary: therefore we are to distinguish in the Law of *Moses*, those things which were merely Mosaical and Levitical, from those things which were Natural and Moral. For the Law or Covenant made by *Moses* in Gods behalf, with the Israelites, contained in it many things of morality, and Gods worship and service, agreeable to the substantial part of the Gospel: but this it did not, *as Mosaical*, but rather *as Evangelical*: For from the beginning of the World to the Incarnation of Christ, there was alwayes, as a thorow-Base to several parts in Musick, the Covenant of the Gospel in some degree running along with the various forms of Mosaical Constitutions, and these often insinuated and pressed in the Old Law: but the Covenant Mosaical, though it was built upon these grounds, was not fashioned by them, but as the Author to the Hebrews saith, *had also Ordinances of Divine Service, and a worldly Sanctuary*; that is, for that Age. And again, calleth them *Carnal Ordinances imposed on them until the time of Reformation*; i. e. of the Gospel it self. Now in all reason, the end should be proportionable to the means. If therefore the means be carnal, so ought also the end: and not spiritual, speaking of the reward. But the Ordinances of the Gospel being not Moral and Natural only, but Spiritual also, ought to have a spiritual or heavenly end. And as the reward upon Obedience, doth exceed that of the Law, so the severity upon disobedience: contrary to the too common Error, that the Gospel is more favourable unto sinners than was the Law. For though indeed the same trivial neglects, or commissions as against the Old Law, are not now punished in a bodily, sensible manner, as were they: yet the punishments generally of the offences against the New Covenant were greater, as *St. Paul* expressly witnesseth to the *Hebrews*. *He that despised Moses's Law dyed without mercy, under two or three witnesses. Of how much sorer punishment, suppose ye shall be thought worthy, who hath troden under foot the Son of God, and accounted the blood of the Covenant, wherewith he was sanctified, an unholy thing; and hath done despite unto the Spirit of Grace, &c. For we know, &c.* Fifthly, the Administration of the New Covenant differed from that of the Old: and that 1. In the Extent comprehending all Nations, without distinction; whereas that of *Moses* was restrained to *Abrahams* Seed, and that by *Isaac*, and that Seed again of *Isaac*, by *Jacob*. And secondly, it extends not only to all Persons, according to the promise made to *Abraham*, that in his Seed all the Nations of the earth should be blessed, and only his own Seed blessed:

Matth. 19. 29.

Deut. 28.

Hebr. 9. 1.  
v. 10.Vide Chrys.  
Tom. 6. Serm.  
94. initio.

Hebr. 2. 2, 3.

Hebr. 10, 28,  
29.

30, 31.

Jer. 31. 34.

Gen. 22. 18.



Hebr. 9. 9.

Hebr. 10. 4.

v. 10.

blest: but to all capacities of man, his spiritual as well as carnal: which the Law of *Moses* did not, as the Author of the Epistle to the *Hebrews* doth witness; where he tells us, how those Legal Rites could not make him that did the service, perfect as pertaining to the conscience. And again, *It is not possible that the blood of Bulls and Goats should take away sins.* But the Soul and Conscience are both purged by the Sacrifice of the New Testament, once offered for all; which was the Body of Christ. Thirdly, It extends to a greater degree of Liberty from the outward servile part of Gods worship, and either directs us only to the more inward and spiritual service, or gives Liberty greater to the Church than anciently was allowed, to accommodate it self to times, and place, and persons in the worship of God, which Liberty was not so far granted under the Old Testament.

Rom. 6. 14.

Rom. 7. 6.

Sixthly, The Law and Covenant made by *Moses* were according to the Letter; but Christ, according to the Spirit. That was exacted upon outward terrors propounded, or Mercies: This, was transacted by an inward principle of Ingenuity and Grace given of God; as St. *Paul* is to be understood: where he saith, *For sin shall not have dominion over you: For ye are not under the Law, but under Grace:* meaning, That now least of all, we should let sin rule over us, being not under the Law, that is, exempted from the penalties and terrors outward, which seemed to constrain obedience, or whose disobedience was remitted upon certain outward Rites, which have no effect upon them who are under the Law of Grace. But the Grace of God so revealed outwardly, and so assisting and inclining inwardly, doth require more ingenuous obedience than formerly: as in the next Chapter it is said; *But now we are delivered from the Law, that being dead wherein we were held, that we should serve in the newness of the Spirit, and not in the oldness of the Letter.*

Hebr. 7. 11.

Now from this adjustment of the Law of *Moses* and of Christ, it is evident in what sense St. *Paul* so oft calls one the Law of Works, and the other the Law of Grace. For he there takes not Law so generally as some would understand him, for all Rule and Doctrine of Holy Life, whereby they comprehend as well Evangelical, as Natural, and Mosaical, but in contradistinction to the Law of the Gospel, published by Christ; viz. the Law, as it was Mosaical, according to which it could justify no man: it being it self to be done away in Christ. For (as the Scripture hath it) *if perfection were by the Levitical Priesthood (for under it the People received the Law) what farther need that another Priest should arise, after the order of Melchisedec, and not be called after the order of Aaron?*

Secondly, Answer from hence may be made to the difficulty, How far the Law of *Moses*, or the Old Law binds under the Gospel? For having shewed that the Gospel, in substance being ancients than the Law of *Moses*, as well because of the moral duties common to all mankind, as the Promises of the Messias contained in it; whatever we find in *Moses* or the Prophets, or the Sacred Historians against any injustice, vice, or irreligion is not to be imputed so much to the Law, as Mosaical, but as Evangelical: And therefore, whatever was Levitical or Mosaical, in that Law given to the Seed of *Abraham*, as such, ceased and had its full completion in Christ. And though many things there found, were alwayes, and still are of excellent use to all men, both morally and judicially taken, so that they cannot be said to have no force upon us; Yet their obliging power, as delivered by *Moses*, and not partaking of the nature of the Gospel, ceases,

ceases, and is extinct; but lives, and is binding as the same belonged anciently to Christs Law, and by it is renewed and confirmed.

Thirdly, The obscurity at least, if not error, of those Notes of distinction found in many learned mens writings; from hence is discerned: such as are these. First, That *the Law* propoundeth wrath, without Mercy: but the Gospel, Mercy and *Justice*. For that the Law thus properly and precisely taken, as distinct in matter, as well as form from the Gospel propounded Mercies as well as Judgments, is most apparent from the eighteenth Chapter of *Deuteronomy*: though as we have shewed, neither the Mercy nor the Judgments were of the same nature as they propounded by the Gospel; but chiefly temporal: For whether the breach of any of *Moses* his Laws, as such, made men obnoxious to Hell, and not only to bodily and temporal punishments, I much question; unless we consider the disobedience formal, and doing presumptuously, which may attend that evil act. Secondly, They say the Law required *internal* and *perfect Righteousness*; the Gospel, *imputed*. But this is very dangerous Doctrine: For first, it doth not appear that the Law, as such, and not partaking of the nature of the Gospel, doth require such internal and perfect Righteousness; it being satisfied with the outwardness and formality of the Letter. Secondly, It must not be granted that Christs Law doth not much more require internal and perfect Righteousness; than the Law; and that to our Justification: For it is one thing to require a thing *absolutely*, and another *necessarily* and indispensibly to such an end. The Gospel doth require as absolute Righteous internal and external, as man is able to attain to in this world; and as the Law required, though not so as if without it there were no possibility of Salvation, though for want of it there be a merie of damnation: but the rigour is qualified and remitted to us upon the intuition of Christs merits, who interposeth for us, with God not to exempt us in any kind from any imaginable part or degree of Holiness competent to us: but to mitigate, and remove the displeasure of God justly conceived against us, for not being perfect. For it no wayes follows, That because such a small proportion of Holiness shall be accepted, and such a vast proportion of wickedness shall be forgiven, and passed over through Gods free Grace in Christ, therefore by the general tenour of the Gospel, God requires no more of the one, nor less of the other. For if the Gospel be (as sure it is) a more holy Law than that of *Moses*, Is it not so because it requires of those under it greater Holiness? A third difference I find is, That the Law promiseth Life, upon condition of Works: but the Gospel, upon condition of our committing our selves to Christ by Faith: This is very ambiguously spoken, and inclining to a very bad sense. For what Life, and what works are we here to understand? It is shewed above how ill-agreed wise Interpreters are, Whether any life besides this present is promised by the Law, as *Mosaic*, and not *Evangelical*? and with this imitation I profess the Negative Part. Again, What works? Are we not to understand Works brought in and appointed by *Moses*? To these works are promised indeed Life, answerable to them; *i. e.* temporal, and no more? But he that saith, we attain Life by committing our selves to Christ by Faith, doth certainly mean Life spiritual and eternal: which vast diversity in the end and reward, quite nulls the comparison. And besides, how by committing our selves to Christ? by Faith? So as that works of the Gospel

Perkins.

spel and Faith should be laid aside? Yes, say they, as to our Justification, though not to the commendation and approbation of our Faith: But the vanity of this we have already discovered, where we have proved, that there is no promise made to us under the Gospel, of being justified by Faith; that the works of Faith may not be as instrumental to our Justification and Salvation as the Act of Faith, so much presumed upon: and that the one is as derogatory to the fulness and freeness of Christs Grace and Gods Mercy, as the other; and no more. A fourth difference is, That the Law was written in Tables of Stone: but the Gospel in the Tables of the Heart; *Jerem. 31. 33. 2 Corinth. 3. 3.* This hath a true sense, and therefore may pass, though lyable to just exceptions, as taking the Scriptures in a sense scarce intended: Fifthly, They say, The Law was instill'd into our Nature at our first Creation: But the Gospel was above nature, and given after the Fall. But we are not to distinguish the part from the whole, nor the inchoation of a thing from its perfection. The Gospel was in more particulars of agreeing with the Law of Nature, then the Law of Moses; and given in substance before the Law of Moses: and 'tis these two whose differences are sought after at present. In the sixth place, it is rightly said, that Moses was the Mediatour of the Old Law, and Christ of the New: by which they explain themselves, That by Law, they mean, Moses his Law: For Moses was not the Mediatour of the Law natural, but Adam rather. And truly in the seventh place, it is said, The Law was dedicated by the blood of Beasts; but the Gospel by the blood of Christ. But the conclusion to these, *viz. That the two Testaments, the Law and the Gospel are two in nature, substance, and kind,* is so far only true, as the Law is taken precisely, for that introduced by Moses; and not concretely and conjoynly with that Covenant made between God and Adam, after his Fall.

CHAP.



## CHAP. XXXV.

*Considerations on the Sacraments of the Law of Moses. Of Circumcision. Of the Reason, Nature, and Ends of it. Of the Passover, the Reason why it was Instituted: Its Use.*

**W**HAT is now said of the nature and distinction of the Covenants made between God and Man, do serve much to the clearing of the Nature and Number of Sacraments here to be explained briefly. For all Sacraments properly so called, are of a Federal nature, between God and Man. And this covenanting made by God and Man, is signed, sealed, and confirmed by these Sacraments: And therefore, according to the variety of these Covenants, is also the variety of the Sacraments; unless we except that most ancient Covenant of all, between God and Man, before his Fall. For while man retained those connatural Graces bestowed on him by God, he needed no such outward helps, as Signs and Sacraments to contain him in due obedience to him, nor such signs of Gods promises to him; being able to act more spiritually, freely, and perfectly then now. But upon the disabling of his inward man by sin once committed, and the hebetation of his mind, it was no less than necessary, that, by his outward senses, occasion should be offered to the increase of his knowledge, fear, love, and faith in God: which is done by the mediation of Sacraments instituted by God: and these diversified according to the variety of the *Oeconomie* it pleased God to use to the World. For under the Law of Nature (before *Moses* or *Abraham*) men stood obliged to serve and worship God: And in this condition the Sacrifices given to God, and Oblations, were of the nature and force of Sacraments: For whether by light of nature, or by special precept, men offered Sacrifice to God, it is apparent that was rather a signal to testify their revering his Majesty, and duty to him, than any actual absolute worship: and to insinuate an absolute Dominion and Right God had to our own lives, in that instead of them which were forfeited to God by sin, we offered Beasts slain to him: and to all things in the World; in that was exhibited to him, so far as might be, and returned that which was received from him.

But to these before *Abraham*, was added that of *Circumcision*; and afterward that of the *Passover*. But we must note, that these two Sacraments, as they were not originally, or from the beginning, instituted of God; so neither to all men, nor for all times: And this will appear from the particular occasions taken, and reasons rendered of their Ordination. For when God commanded *Abraham* to circumcise his Son, and

himself, and all the Males of his Family, it was no sign at all of any thing of general concernment to mankind, or of the Messias simply, which was before promised; but it was a sign only that the Messias should proceed out of his Loyns, and Seed: which was an extraordinary honour and singular priviledge conferred on him. It was a sign likewise, that his Seed were specially chosen to Gods favour, to inherit that promised Land, and many other temporal blessings; which no wayes concerned other Nations. It might have likewise many other moral purposes which are ingeniously sought out, and largely profecuted by others, and especially *Postillers*.

Rom. 4. 11.

v. 10, 11, 12,  
13.

'Tis true, that many Nations observed this Rite of Circumcision, but not by the appointment of God, nor by their own invention, but as transmitted to them from such who either descended from *Abraham*, or received it from him. Neither was it to such of the Nature of a Sacrament, because not given them of God, and having no promises annext to that A&t in them, but only as in *Abraham*. For the Covenant that God made with mankind, which we have call'd the Covenant of Works, in opposition to that of Faith, in *Christ*, made after the Fall, was made to *Adam* and all his, for ever, though all the Posterity of *Adam* reaped not the like visible benefit from it. And this second Covenant received several additions according to the several Revelations, it pleased God to make unto some part of mankind above others; and that with *Abraham* and his Seed: The first eminent A&t of God was to *Abraham* himself, when he gave him the Promise that the Messias should descend from him, and gave him the sign of Circumcision, a *Seal of the Righteousness of the Faith which he had being uncircumcised, &c.* Now what Faith was that which *Abraham* had before he was circumcised? Not that which moved him to offer his Son *Isaac* to God, and yet believe that he should inherit the blessings promised to him: but it was that Faith which he had in the more ancient and general promise with *Adam*, concerning the Messias. For otherwise, the Apostles argument to prove that we are justified by Faith, and not by works of the Law, would not hold good; which in effect is this. The same way that the Patriarchs, and particularly your Father *Abraham* was justified, the same way must ye be justified too: but *Abraham* was not justified by the works of the Law, but by Faith in *Christ*. And this appeareth plainly. For if *Abraham* were justified before the Law, and before Circumcision, then surely Circumcision and the works of the Law could not avail to his Justification. For how was Faith reckoned to *Abraham* for righteousness? In circumcision, or in uncircumcision? not in circumcision, but in uncircumcision. And he received the sign of Circumcision as a seal of the Righteousness of the Faith he had being yet uncircumcised. From whence it appeareth, That what Covenant was made with *Abraham* by Circumcision, was not absolutely a new Covenant, but a special Priviledge, and Interest given to him in that long before, made with *Adam* after his breaking the first Covenant of Obedience and Works. And thus we see the nature and end of the first Sacrament given to the Jews before *Christ*, Circumcision.

And the second Sacrament of Note, was much of the same nature; as not being given to make an absolute generally new Covenant with Mankind, but only to signify the peculiar Right that People had to the general Covenants, above others; that as Gods First-born sons of all Nations, they should have a double portion of that Grace, which was common

mon otherwise to all. And farther, an addition of Temporal blessings was made sure to them by it; upon the due observation of those Rites and Laws given them: And this blessing was twofold hereby signified, First, that passed, in delivering them so eminently and miraculously from the destroying Angel, who killed the First-born of the *Egyptians*, and brought them from that tedious and grievous bondage, by which they were oppressed. And therefore it was called *the Passover*. The second consisted in an Assurance of the promised Possessions in the Land of *Canaan*. Now besides these literal significations and ends, there were two other Spiritually intimated by them relating to the Gospel, and its Services. And they were, the remission of sins in Baptism; and the right to heaven, and bliss after death by the participation of the means of Salvation, the Mannah of his Word, and the Sacraments of his Promises, Baptism and the Holy Eucharist.

## CHAP. XXXVI.

*Of the Evangelical Sacraments. Of the various application of the name Sacrament. Two Sacraments Univocally so called under the Gospel, only: The others Equivocally. Five conditions of a Sacrament. Of the reputed Sacraments of Orders, Matrimony, and Extream Unction in particular.*

**A**S under the Old Testament, There were some special Sacraments and properly so called, besides many others, which by mens interpretation, rather than Gods Institution, were so called; as the Tree of Life in Paradise, *Noahs* Ark, Passing through the Red Sea, the Brazen Serpent, and the like; so also, under the Gospel, as *St. Paul* saith, *There are Gods many, and Lords many, but to us there is but one God*; so are there Sacraments many, and many Sacramental things, but to us there are but two Sacraments properly so called: Baptism, and the Eucharist, or Supper of the Lord. Therefore purposing to speak of all the reputed, as well as real Sacraments of the Gospel, (because though not Sacraments yet very Sacred, and deserving well to be understood) we shall divide them into equivocal or improper; and univocal or proper Sacraments. Of the former rank we make Orders sacred. Matrimony, Penitence, or Repentance, Confirmation, and extream Unction: Of the latter sort are Baptism, and the Supper of the Lord.



Now to understand the just reason of this discrimination between Sacraments, it is necessary that we pitch upon some general Definition of a true Sacrament, by which as a Light, and Rule, the False are to be examined and judged. And therefore shall resume our Definition before laid down of a Sacrament. *A Sacrament is a visible sign instituted by God to produce an invisible grace in the soul of man: which we have already defended.*

Præf. de  
Sacram. Qu.  
6. c. 1.

But if men will religiously contend about words, it cannot be denyed, That many of the Ancient and Holy Fathers, and the perpetual language of the Church have accustomed themselves to call many more things than Two, or Seven, or perhaps Seven times seven, Sacraments: because they do contain something sacred and mysterious in them; but yet amount not to the perfection either of our received two Sacraments, or perhaps of the other five. And so long as men hold to the true and real Sacraments, and have the due use of them, it matters not much, if they give the Name Sacrament unto those things which are not worthy of it; as *Whitaker* hath well said.

1 Cor. 10. 1,  
2, 3, 4.

But the Reasons against more than two Sacraments in the proper sense, may be these. First, That we read not of the institution of any more than two, by God or Christ, in the New Testament; and of these two clear evidence there is found, as may more fully be seen, when we come to treat of them. Nay, according to the judgment of many of the Ancients, it was Christs intention we should have but two Sacraments, when he shed from his Divine side, water and blood, insinuating thereby Baptism, and the Sacrament of his Blood. And another argument intimating that Christ ordained but two Sacraments in the New Testament, is taken from the due conformity between the Shadows and Types of the Law, and the Substance of the Gospel: The Law had but two Sacraments proper, Circumcision and the Passover; and therefore that these two should prefigure only two in the Gospel, is most probable. But not only the Fathers of old, but Schoolmen did alwayes acknowledge a due proportion to be observed between these. And it makes nothing against this, That the Fathers do often call some at least of the other five, Sacraments; because then they spoke at large, as we said before.

A second general Reason may be, That as they have no precept, so have they no promise from Christ, of Grace or favour Spiritual. For Ordination indeed hath an ordinary Gift of Ecclesiastical Power, but no assurance of special Grace belonging to it. Confirmation hath a good and laudable end, but no special Promise to it. Repentance hath a promise, but hath no outward visible sign, upon which the word is built, to make it a Sacrament: for this is a

Third Reason of the equality of Sacraments, Because all true and proper Sacraments must consist as well of outward signs, to which the word and Grace are annext, as of the Grace it self therein given. But all these Sacraments have not these Signs, and they which have an appearance of visible signs, have them not by Gods institution.

Fourthly, The Sacraments of the Gospel are of concernment to all true Christians, according to their Capacities: but all Christians are not, by the confession of the Patrons of seven Sacraments, bound to marry, or to be in Holy Orders. Nay, some are absolutely interdicted the use of some of the reputed Sacraments, as are women from Holy Orders; therefore, whatever may possibly be said concerning the not circumcising of Women under

under the Law, under the Gospel there being neither Male nor Female, as *St. Paul* affirmeth, that cannot be a Sacrament equal in sacredness, or necessity, of which Women are not capable.

Fifthly, The general Nature of Sacraments is such as renders the due Partakers of them more holy than they are, who receive them not: but no man saies that marriage faithfully observed doth make any person more holy then Virginity, therefore it cannot be a Sacrament: If they here say, That Marriage is not a Sacrament absolutely, but only as it is Christian, and a representation of Christs conjunction with his Church; and as it is blessed by the Priest. I answer, First to this latter; That  *blessing*  doth not alter the kind of the thing, but only sanctifies the thing it self: and therefore Marriage in Heathens and Christians is the same in nature; but not in the circumstances of Holiness. And whenas *St. Paul* saith in his Epistle to the *Ephesians*, having before treated of solemn Marriage, *This is a great mystery*: from whence commonly is drawn an argument of a Sacramentals in Marriage of Christians; the reply is easie, which quite nulls the conclusion. First, Because it is as manifest as a thing need be, that *St. Paul* doth speak rather of Heathens marriage than Christian, as appears from his citation of the first institution of Marriage, which comprehends all: and therefore according to themselves, could not intend to make a Sacrament of it, seeing it is no Sacrament, but as Christian. Secondly, The word being  *Mystery* , doth not properly signifie a Sacrament, however the Vulgar Translation might be allowed to translate it so; but not men, upon that term given at large, to draw it into the number of Sacraments. *St. Paul* saith to the *Corinthians*, *Behold I show you a mystery, we shall not all dye, but we shall all be changed*. Is this a Sacrament also? But many of the Fathers have so called it. It may be so, in the sense before spoken of, in which many more things may so be called. But lastly, The Apostle in that Place to the *Ephesians* doth expressly remove that term  *Mystery*  from the natural or civil conjunction of Man and Woman in Matrimony, and restrain it to Christ and his Church; and doth not so much as say that Marriage is a mystery. For having drawn an Argument for the due observation of Wedlock and its Rights; that seeing Christ loved his Church, man should love his Church; he addeth afterward, *This is a great mystery: but I speak of Christ and the Church*: which is as if it had been said, Here is a great Mystery; but this Mystery I mean not. So much of external Marriage, but internal, between Christ and his Church.

But after all this, seeing we grant with many of the Ancients, That the name Sacrament is communicable to more than two, it is not much worth the contending, whether we make more or fewer than seven; while, we reserve a peculiar sacredness to these two above others. Let us rather touch upon them in their nature, than name; as best worthy to be rightly understood.

And first of Orders briefly, as having spoken thereof in treating of the Political Power of the Church, and there shown the necessity of them according to Christs intention and institution; which was to make a discrimination between Persons, and the several Members of that Body, the Church, of which he is the Head; as is also sufficiently insinuated by *St. Paul*, to the *Corinthians*, saying; *But now hath God set the Members every one of them in the Body as it hath pleased him*: where he doth not speak of moral, but Political excellency, and order of Inferiour and Superiour: From whence

Eph. 5. 31, 32

1 Cor. 15.

Eph. 5. 27, 29.

32.

1 Cor. 12. 18.

the

Civ. Dei. Lib.  
19. 13.

Isidorus Hi-  
spalens. Orig.  
Lib. 7. c. 12.

the name of the Function is taken. For as St. *Augustine* defines it, *Order is the disposing or ranking of equal and unequal things in their proper places.* And therefore sometimes the Church is divided by the Ancients into Clergy and Laity, as two Orders. Again, The Clergy by the Ancients into three only, Bishop, Priest, and Deacon, as *Optatus*. Afterwards some made six, some seven, some nine, as *Hispalensis*, who likewise subdivideth the Bishop into four Orders, Patriarch, Metropolitane, Arch-Bishop, and simple Bishop. So that it were not worth the labour to strive about words here; and especially in distinguishing Order from Degree in the Church. For though the distinction in nature be manifest between the first importing a diversity in kind, and the other in condition of the same kind, yet the Church cannot be thought to speak so circumspectly at all times, and so precisely, as not to use them promiscuously divers times; so that because she sometimes speaks of Degrees, they should deny the Order of the same thing. Neither are we to mutiny against the Constitutions of Eastern and Western Churches; which in progress of time, added some inferiour Orders to those most anciently received in the Church; viz. of Bishop, Priest, and Deacon: For I take it to be no invasion of Christs Right, to call to the assistance of such as he had constituted, such as he did not ordain to that end: but to retrench of the number, to dissolve that Order which he appointed, that is sacrilegious. What then may we call Orders, but *The Collation of an Ecclesiastical Faculty or Power to serve God and the Church, by such as are authorized by God, using the necessary Forms of Words and Rites thereunto required, according to his order of Ministration.*

Now we have already shewed, That as no man can create himself a secular, neither can he an Ecclesiastical Officer: and as no man in that Polity can be created but by one in Authority rightly derived to him, so can none in Spiritual matters be ordained to Ecclesiastical Ministration, but he that is thereunto called by some in Lawful, or at least, real Power: And therefore such who are chosen and appointed by the common people, are but common people after such vainly affected callings: and they who are of an inferiour Order were never acknowledged to have power to create one of a Superiour to them: As it was never endured in the Church till of late dayes, that Priests should appoint Bishops or Priests: because, though Power of the Keys were communicated to them, in reference to the two Principal and necessary Sacraments; yet never as to the whole complex notion of the same, which consists of Jurisdiction, as well as Knowledge and Intercession. And the School argument, which at least, hath given occasion to confound the Order of Bishop and Priest is very false and frivolous: supposing all Ecclesiastical Orders to be so denominated *in ordine ad consecrandum* from their relation to the Power of Consecrating the Body and Blood of Christ in the Eucharist; because they suppose that to be the supream Mystery and End of Priestly Office; but the distinction of Power Political and Mystical in the Church quite overthrows that: For the Power of Jurisdiction is greater in its kind, than that of celebrating, and therefore not so vainly to be taken. Again, the Orders of the Church are so called from the Relation they have to the Body Ecclesiastical, or outward Form and Constitution of it; which is made up of all of them by a gradual ascent, from the lowest to the highest; which make that Hierarchy, without which a Church has but very little to show that it is a Church, but is forc'd to shroud it self under the obscure privileges of being an invisible Church, though not visible. Orders therefore



therefore thus duly administred, though they be not a Sacrament ( for then must there be seven Sacraments subordinate to the other famous seven; because generally seven sorts of Orders are administred in the Church ) yet are they Sacramental things, that is, Sacred, and no less necessary to the constituting a Visible Body of Christ than are the others to the Invisible : And though that cannot presently be concluded to be a true Church of Christ which hath them, I do not see how that can be a true Church which hath them not.

And for that which is commonly called Extream Unction; being the Anointing of the Infirm of Body, or such as are despaired of, as to this Life: I see no great matter to be objected against it, no more did *Luther*, nor *Bucer*, nor some other eminent Reformers for a good while after they left *Rome*; provided it be done with that solemnity and soundness of invocation of God, and Benediction of the deceasing Party as may comfort and strengthen him in his last Agonies: It being ancient, though not so old as is pretended, nor ministred in the same manner, as now. For in the beginning, not one, but many Presbyters of the Church were called according to the advice of *St. James*, to pray over the sick, and to anoint him with common, not compounded, or artificial Oyl, and that not without a miraculous event. But because the Miracle is now ceased, it is no good reason the thing it self should be detested. For Primitively a Miracle did accompany Baptism too, which ceasing, no man will declare the Sacrament it self ought to cease likewise. The Superstitions of Prayer and some other Rites added of late; whereby the simplicity of it hath been corrupted, is a more reasonable ground of laying it down: Neither is the want thereof in that formality to be charged upon a Church, where there is commanded and continued due Ministration to the Sick, answerable to the necessities of Body and Soul. But though the use hereof be ancient, yet the name *Sacrament* hath not so anciently been ascribed to it, in the sense at this day Current. And *Innocent* the first, who is reported to have so called it, doth permit others besides Priests to minister the same to the Sick, the Chrism or Oyl being made by the Bishop.

James 1. 14, 15

## CHAP. XXXVII.

*Of Confirmation. What it is. The Reasons of it. The Proper Minister of it. Of Unction threefold in Confirmation. Of Sacramental Repentance and Penance. The Effects thereof.*

**B**UT of *Confirmation* much greater esteem hath ever been, and ought still to be had; though not so much as some of the Ancients, and divers Modern Schoolmen would exalt it to: unless a favourable interpretation be made of their judgments delivered concerning it. For they make it more useful than Baptism it self: and impute the efficacy of Baptism in great part unto this Sacrament. To judge the better of which Opinion, it is to be consider'd what this Confirmation is. Confirmation may be said to be a solemn Act of Invocation of God, and Benediction of a Person upon his publick Profession of that Christian Faith into which he was before baptized. First, It was required that the Person capable of this Ceremony, should have first been baptized: For he was not hereby made a Christian, but, as the word importeth, confirmed in that Faith, into which he had been baptized. And the Reasons hereof were such then as do to this day commend exceedingly the use of it; *viz.* Because some were baptized in their minority or infancy, when, wanting common judgment, they could not discern the nature, use, and end of Baptism: and therefore very requisite it was that they should after due and sober information in the mysteries and principles of Christian Religion, make in their own person such a publick Profession of the same as they were bound to do at the time of their baptism; according as the Church Catechism of *Strasburgh*, since the Reformation, well thus expresses it, by Scholar and Master. *Schol. We that are children and instructed in the Faith of Christ, ought to profess the same in publick, and clearly in the Church, seeing we could not do this, when we were baptized. Mast. How are ye confirmed? Schol. By publick blessing, intercession of the Church, with imposition of hands. Mast. But how art thou assured of this? Schol. We have the Word of God, when he says, Let little Children come unto me, &c.* Thus that Catechise. Another reason may be the danger from the multitude of Hereticks which possibly might have corrupted such young beginners in the Faith, therefore, as well for the better securing such persons, as for the satisfaction of the Church, that they who were once enter'd into communion with it, did so persevere inviolate in the same, this excellent Rite was instituted. And surely, because it notably discriminates Schismatics and Erroneous persons from sober and faithful Members of Christ, and his Church; it is by vain, ignorant, and ungodly persons scoffed at, railed at, and contemned. A third Reason

Catechismus  
Argentora-  
tensis. p. 36.  
D. Cum nos pu-  
eri instituti  
sumus in fide  
Christiana de-  
bemus eam pa-  
lam & aperte  
profiteri, &c.

Reason respecteth the time to come, wherein a man foreseeing the many and great temptations of the World, Flesh, and Devil, which he had renounced in Baptism, to increase upon him, as he converses more with the World, doth thereby fortifie himself by a renewed profession of his Faith and Obedience to Christ. Fourthly, to this conduceth very much the Benediction of his Ghostly Father, the Bishop, and the joynt prayers of all the Congregation, which ought devoutly to be put up to God for the descent of his Grace, to preserve the persons so confirmed in that holy profession: which should be most earnestly desired by every pious heart that likes his Religion, and fears his own frailties. And it is to me an infallible argument of desperate unchristian prophaneness, or a new superstition instilled into men, alienating them from the truth of that Religion in which they were educated, who carp at this so godly Constitution: their best ground being that which is to all their frivolous reasonings, Because no expresse place of Scripture commands it directly: and because it is possible to be saved without it: It is possible that we may be saved without many things which we daily use in Religion; and yet they contemptuously and wilfully omitted, may be a just and certain cause of our condemnation: the Scriptures having not limited God to those means of saving us, which they have, if we would be saved: And yet again, they have not so particularized our duties, that there should be nothing accepted by God from us which they have not expressed. I find it disputed on both sides, whether this Rite be of Divine Institution or not: and shall not determine it: but in this both Ancient and Modern, Eastern and Western Churches are agreed that it is of Divine use, and therefore I may determine it to be pious and profitable; and them who oppose it, to *speak evil of the things they understand not*, for which they may utterly perish in their own corruption,

2 Pet. 2.

But I suppose the proper Minister of this Solemnity, who alwayes was the Bishop of the Church, hath much turned the stomach of those who very unhappily have none; or most wickedly endeavour to have none, against it. For considering how little is to be said against it, how much for it, the principle ground why they are bent against it, must be to defend themselves from notorious defects. To understand this, as likewise the manner of performing this Sacramental Rite, it is to be noted, there was a threefold use of Unction, called also *Chrism*, in the ancient Church; whereof one pertained to the Presbyter or Priest: who in the time of Baptism was wont to anoint the party baptized on the crown of the Head. The other two were properly belonging to the Bishop, the one being done presently after Baptism on the forehead, after the Priest had anointed him on the crown of the Head: which custom the Greek Church retain to this day, as their Patriarch *Hieremias* witnesseth: and when this was done, I suppose there followed no other Confirmation: but after the deferring of Baptism ceased, and the appointed times of *Easter* and *Pentecost* for that Sacrament were laid aside; and children, and that at all times, and in all places of Divine worship, were admitted to Baptism; and not alwayes, as most anciently, in the presence of the Bishop, then it became necessary that a peculiar time, and proper services should be appointed to this Solemnity; wherein the Party to be confirmed was signed in the forehead by the Bishop only, as before in substance, but with variation of circumstances. In *Gregory the Great's* days, it should seem the breast was anointed by the Priest. What need we trouble our selves in such things as were alterable, in that unalterable

*Hieremias*  
Patr. Cap 7.  
Censure Oriental.

*Gregor. M.*  
Epist. Lib 3.  
9.



solemnity: our Churches moderation endeavouring to prevail upon the modesty of some dissatisfied persons in it, have incurred the censure of other Churches, in paring that Ordinance to the Quick from unnecessary excrescencies, without any effect upon her own undutiful children, but pertinacy and petulancy, in their private morosities, which at length may teach us, how vain such charms of Charity are used upon such deaf Adders, and unnatural Vipers: whom nothing will satisfy but the tearing to pieces the womb that conceived them. And that they may do with it what they list, they make the Church speak what they list, many times. And therefore, though it hath wisely declared, and plainly, but for two Sacraments, ordinarily necessary to salvation, they are wont to exclaim against it; thereby inferring conumeliously that she holds more, though not so necessary: which had been no slander, if they at the same time had used that candour which became them in stating the mind of the Church, as they might, and ought: but to do this here, or in other cases, were to do themselves or Cause wrong; and to be just to us, were to be cruel to themselves.

A fifth pretended Sacrament is that of *Repentance*, sometimes also called *Penance* with us: For so I read Mr. *Bradford* in his Sermon on the Fourth of *Matthew* and the seventeenth, to speak, saying; *Penance is a sorrowing or forethinking of our sins past: an earnest purpose to amend, or turning to God with a trust of pardon.* Which description may suffice us at present. For the first thing in Repentance is a sound judgment of the evil of the Facts committed or omitted; the next is a belief and sense of the evil of punishment incurred by such enormities: A third degree or act of the mind is a change of the resolution for the time to come, to act more reasonably and faithfully. A fourth is an apprehension of the Grace and Mercy of God towards him upon his humiliation and return. A fifth the real execution and putting in outward practise the good purposes of heart, in effects proper to Repentance. A sixth is not to repent of Repentance, or return to the offenses for which he was so grieved: and which he renounced. A seventh is the fruits on Gods part signifying his favour towards such truly penitent Persons by the comfortable testimony of his Spirit of Grace, in their Consciences witnessing the remission of sins, and reconciliation to God in the face of Jesus Christ.

The Parts of Repentance are commonly made these three: *Contrition*, *Confession*, and *Satisfaction*: which to speak properly cannot so be called: For of all these only Contrition is of the very nature of Repentance: but Confession and Satisfaction, to which we may adde Reformation or Renovation, are rather the Effects than Parts of Repentance: but these two are never the same in proper language. And therefore in vain do they go about to justify that description as proper, of Repentance, which both *Chrysostome* and *Ambrose* do give us; That it is such a change which committeth not the same things again. And, an act whereby we lament sins passed, and commit not sins to be lamented. There can be nothing done more indiscreetly against a mans self, or injuriously against the Fathers, than to make every true saying of theirs a definition: or to deny them the liberty of their Rhetorical pen sometimes, when they write what is true, though not so accurately, as the laws of Logick may require. If we mistake not, this abuse of the Fathers hath done great mischief in the Schoolmens works, and especially *Thomas's*, as may appear in his Summes, where a bare and secure asseveration of some Father, is taken for a very

very sufficient definition, and turns the controversie quite another way, then reason according to Scripture would have it go. We all know that the Fathers, as all other Writers, even the Scriptures themselves, spake not alwayes Definitions: and the Definitions they gave were not alwayes according to the Rules and Practise of Logicians, but Rhetoricians; with whom it is most frequent to describe a thing from the proper and most commendable effect. If a man should say he is a Souldier indeed, who never yieldeth till he hath gotten the victory, should speak very true: but this were no true definition of a Souldier: For a Souldier may loose the Victory. And so Repentance is that which repeateth not former sins before forrowed for, but this doth not prove that to be no repentance which ceasing, a man returns to his former evil course; or that that repentance persever'd in which was broken off, might not have carryed him to heaven. For who knows not that all habits moral, and graces spiritual, (such as are Faith and Repentance) have their proper seat in the inward man, affect the mind and heart immediately, and from thence are known primarily and described? Outward acts are but the effects: and the effects may illustrate, but cannot be of the essence of the Cause. Therefore Repentance exactly considered is nothing more than a thorow change of the mind and heart from things contrary to Gods will, and to the obedience of the same. This is true repentance; and if it be not effectual, it is because it is not, that is, perseveres not in that good nature. It were ridiculous to say, A man never went towards London, it was no real motion, because he turned back again, and never came at that place. And no less, that a man never truly repented, because he gave over, and reaped not the fruits of Repentance. For the nature of Repentance might be the same, though vastly different as to the end. Once true Grace, and alwayes true Grace, say they: but what word of God, what judgment of the wisest and holiest Christians have they to bear witness to their presumptuous assertion? Their own authority is too inconsiderable, and their argument most vain which is taken from the event; and begs the question when they thus talk, If it be true Grace it will persevere; and if it persevere, it is true: So that give the highest instance that ever was, or any mans mind can imagine possible to be, of Grace, which failed: they answer very safely, (if as wisely) It was not true, for it faild. But this is no place to argue this point.

We except not against the things themselves in Repentance, Contrition, Confession, Satisfaction, but against the order they are set in: though Mr. Bradford, that holy and learned man, sticks not at that accurateness in his former Sermon, speaking thus: *We say penance hath three parts, Contrition, if you understand it for an hearty sorrow for sin: Confession, if ye understand it for faith of free pardon, in Gods mercy by Jesus Christ: and Satisfaction, if you understand it not to Godwards — but to Manwards, in restitution of things wrongfully and fraudulently gotten, of name hindred, by our slaunders; and in newness of life.* And Perkins makes our consent with the Roman Church to consist in this: *That Repentance stands, especially for practise, in Contrition of heart, Confession of mouth, Satisfaction in work or deed.* Of these therefore we shall speak briefly and distinctly.

Perk. Reform.  
Cath.

## CHAP. XXXVIII.

*Of the Proper affections of Repentance, Compunction, Attrition and Contrition. Attrition is an Evangelical Grace as well as Contrition. Of Confession: Its Nature, Grounds, and Uses. How it is abused. The Reasons against it answered.*

Bernard. de  
modo bene  
vivendi,  
Serm. 10.

**C**ompunction is a general word comprehending *Contrition* and *Attrition*, the proper parts of *Repentance*: and according to *Bernard*, is an humiliation of the mind proceeding from the remembrance of sin, and the fear of Gods Judgment, &c. But if we take Compunction generally, it may be rather described An humiliation of mind proceeding from an apprehension of the Evil of sin. Now the Evil of sin being twofold, doth divide this Compunction into two kinds, *Contrition* and *Attrition*. Contrition being, according to the most received distinction of it from Attrition, *A sincere and hearty sorrow of mind, upon the sight and sense of the Evil of sin, in it self, and the offence thereby committed against Almighty God his goodness chiefly*: But there is another mischief in sin, and that doth principally concern the Offender himself, who thereby having violated Gods most just and holy Laws, and incurred his displeasure, has made him self obnoxious to the curses denounced against the breakers thereof: and therefore is a *Terror of Conscience conceived upon the apprehension of Gods wrath justly due to him, and impending over him*. These, by some, are made not only different (as in truth they are) but contrary too: so that Attrition should be rather an addition to former Guilt, than a method of evading Gods wrath, and being reconciled unto him: and their reason is, because it is not done in Faith: Hence they distinguish between *Legal* and *Evangelical* humiliation: making the former quite distinct from the latter, and opposite to it. Legal contrition, say they (which is Attrition) is nothing but a remorse of Conscience for sin in regard of the wrath and judgment of God, and it is no grace of God at all, nor any part, or cause of Repentance, but only an occasion thereof, and that by the mercy of God: for of it self it is the sting of the Law, and the very entrance into the Pit of Hell. Evangelical Contrition is when a repentant sinner is grieved for his sin, not so much for fear of Hell, or any other punishment, as because he hath offended and displeased so good and merciful a God. This Contrition is caused by the Ministry of the Gospel, &c. In this vulgar account of Attrition and Contrition, or the two Parts of Contrition, Legal and Evangelical, is a twofold error committed, not to be passed lightly over. The one is a rude and common misapprehension of the state of the Gospel, as if it were all made up of Mercy, and consisted not at all of Justice and Vengeance to be executed upon sinners breaking the Law of the Gospel: but whatever

Perkins.

we



we can reasonably suppose of mercy, must be owing altogether to the Gospel: but if any threatening, and severities of Justice be feared, that must be borrowed from the Law. And what Law I pray do they mean? The Old Law, I doubt not. But the Law before Christ had its moralities or perpetual Duties, and its Mosaicalness which was transient, and is now actually ceased, as all the Obligations and Penalties belonging thereto. It cannot be that then which moves to this Legal Contrition: but if any thing, the moral and perpetual part, consisting of Justice and Equity, which are no less an ingredient into the Gospel than into the Law properly so called. And, because there is nothing more absurd and ridiculous, than to have a Law consisting of just and holy Precepts and Rules: which shall not also consist of proportionable Rewards of the Observers and Breakers thereof; returning as St. Paul teaches us at large in his Epistle to the Romans, to the Jew and to the Gentile doing well, *honour and glory; and shame and wrath to the evil doer*: speaking of the present state of the Gospel. And we have before shewed, That so far is the Gospel from being made up of all mercy, that the judgments and punishments therein decreed against Sinners, are more grievous than they in the Law: and therefore, the Gospel is called a *Book of Good tidings or News*: not because the Sinner impenitent shall find any more favour, or so much as he might under the Old Law; but because the Salvation here published is of greater extent, comprehending all Nations and states of men; which the Law did not: And also offering full and free means of Repentance, and reconciliation to God through Christ, and a treasure of Grace, as well to assist in the performing of the condition of the Gospel, as to pardon and remit what is committed against it, upon humiliation and repentance. So that the Gospel has a Legal part (as the phrase is) and Evangelical: And the terrours of the Gospel or Legal Part of it have just influence upon the Consciences of men to humble and affright them, though there should be no such thing extant as the Old Testament: and therefore the Attrition of a Sinner under the guilt and sense of his sins, is much more an effect of the Gospel than of the Law. And therefore is not so the entrance into the Pit of Hell, as if directly it lead to Hell: For 'tis security and presumption that lead thither, rather than the sorrow of Attrition: This is certainly a direct occasion of going to Heaven, and is an inferiour degree of more ingenuous sorrow and true contrition: For this Legal (as it is called) Contrition is caused by the ministry of the Gospel too, and is an effect of Evangelical Faith, whereby a Christian, having thorowly assented to, and been affected with the severe and holy Doctrine thereof, becomes humbled under it; and is brought to the sight and admiration, and affection of the other Part of it, which to the truly broken and penitent offereth Grace and Pardon. That which seems to have mislead so many into a false notion of the Gospel, is the term Gospel or Evangel it self, which sounds nothing so much as mercy: though the English or Saxon word, we know, signifies originally no more than *Gods Speech*, which is indifferent to Mercy and Justice both. And such places as this of St. Paul, *The Law worketh wrath*: as if he had meant to say thereby, that the Gospel did not work wrath as did the Law: but that was far from his purpose; intending only to shew the difference between the Law and the Gospel (as they stood opposed) to be in this, That the Law without the Gospel, which St. Paul preached, wrought wrath without remedy, but the Gospel though it propoundeth and threatneth wrath too, to the unbelieving and disobedient,

Rom. 2. 2, 3, 4.  
5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10.

O Soror, nulla  
res sic nos ab  
omni peccato  
custodit immu-  
nes sicut timor  
inferni et amor  
Dei. Bern. de  
prodo bene  
vivend. Serm.  
4.  
Εἰ μὴ γέν-  
ναν πείνησιν,  
εἰ μὴ κόλασιν  
ἐτίμασιν ἢ  
ἀν πολλοὶ τῆς  
βασιλείας ἰ-  
πέτηρον, &c.  
Chryl. Serm.  
7. Antioch.  
pag. 512. To. 6

Rom. 4. 15.

disobedient, yet continued in it also a sufficient and proper remedy against all those Evils. And thus far of the very intrinſick nature of Repentance, Attrition, and Contrition; which are the two proper Parts of it.

The two moſt noted acts or effects (for Parts they are not) are Confession and Satisfaction. And firſt we ſhall explain this Confession by theſe degrees. Firſt, Out of the Abundance of the heart it muſt neceſſarily be that the mouth ſhould ſpeak, whether good or evil, truth or falſhood, joy or ſorrow. How then can it reaſonably be ſuppoſed that no outward expreſſion ſhould appear of ſo great anguiſh of mind, as is ſuppoſed to affect the ſoul truly humbled and penitent? No ſober man, much leſs good Chriſtian, can chooſe but commend ſuch Acts as this of true Repentance. For, as the compariſon of an ancient Father hath it well; As it is with him that hath almoſt ſurfeited himſelf with ill digeſted or unwholeſome meat lying heavy upon his ſtomach, muſt caſt it forth before he can well be eaſed or cured; even ſo he whoſe ſoul is oppreſſed with the filth, guilt, and weight of his ſins, muſt vomit them up by due Confession, before he can reaſonably expect remedy and forgivenes. Many and very preſſing are the adviſes and precepts of Holy Scripture to confeſs our ſins, and many promiſes to ſuch as do confeſs, annexed: which not intending at preſent, ſo much a Parænetical or hortatory Diſcourſe, as Dogmatical for the ſettlement and information of the Judgment and Conſciences, I ſhall paſs over, as agreed to on all hands, in the general. But Confession of ſins being ſo variously taken; viz. for confeſſion to God, and confeſſion to Man; for confeſſion private, and confeſſion publick; for confeſſion to our brother, whom we have offended particularly, and confeſſion to the Church, to which we have given ſcandal, none ever took the boldneſs on them to deny abſolutely the uſe of Confession. Nay I cannot find any ſeriously and poſitively denying the lawfulness or uſefulneſs of private or auricular confeſſion to the Prieſt or Miniſter. Some indeed very ignorant, and no leſs ſuperſtitious perſons, are offended at the word *Auricular*, from the common uſe of it amongſt them whoſe Doctrine and Practice have corrupted it. But the ancient uſe thereof was quite otherwiſe than now adayes it is: as it is thus expreſſed by Biſhop Jewel. *It is learnedly noted by Biſhop Rhenanus, the Sinner when he began to miſlike himſelf, and to be penitent for his wicked life, for that he had offended God and his Church, came firſt unto the Biſhop and Prieſt, as unto the mouths of the Church, and opened unto him the whole burden of his heart. Afterward he was by them brought into the Congregation, and there made the ſame confeſſion openly before his brethren: and farther was appointed to make ſatisfaction by open Penance: which being duly and humbly done, he was reſtored again openly unto the Church, by laying on of the hands of Prieſts and Elders.*

Jewel! Defence p. 156.

Perkins on Gal. 5. 19, 20.

Perkins on the Galatians ſpeaketh thus: — *This muſt farther admoniſh us, never to hide or excuſe our ſins, but freely to confeſs them before God, and before men alſo, when need requires. Whether we confeſs them or not, they are manifeſt, and the ingenuous confeſſion of them is the way to cover them, Pſal. 32. 1, 4.*

Luther Coll. Com. p. 257. Engliſh.

Luther in his *Colloquies* delivers his opinion of Confession in theſe words: *The chiefſt Cauſe why we hold the Confession, is this, that the Catechiſm may be rehearſed, and heard particularly, to the end they may learn and underſtand the ſame: However I, for my part, will never adviſe Confession to be intermitted: for it is not a man that abſolveth me from my ſins, but God himſelf. And ſee pag. 258. How ſins are to be confeſſed.* Another

Another of our Church speaketh thus: 'No kind of Confession, either public or private, is disallowed by us, that is any ways requisite for the due execution of that ancient power of the Keys, which Christ bestowed on his Church: the thing that we reject is that new Pick-lock of Sacramental Confession, obtruded upon mens consciences, as a matter necessary to salvation; by the Canons of the late Council of *Trent*. Sess. 14. c. 6. The Canon here intended I suppose is the Fifth of the Fourth Session, under *Julius* the Third.

Archbishop  
Usher's Answer  
to the Chal-  
lenge. p. 84.

Mr. *Perkins* again in another place saith; 'In troubles of conscience, it is meet and convenient that there should be always used private Confession. For *James* saith, *ch. 5. v. 16. Confess your faults one to another, and pray one for another, &c.* For in all reason the Physician must first know the Disease before he can apply the remedy: and the grief of the heart will not be discerned, unless it be manifested by the confession of the Party diseased. In private Confessions these Caveats must be observed. First, It must not be urged as a thing absolutely necessary, without which there can be no satisfaction. Again, It is not fit that Confession should be of all sins, but only of the Scruple it self. [Here *Perkins*'s assertion is meerly of his own pleasure, and against his own rule, which requireth that the Spiritual, as well as Corporal Physician, should understand all Diseases; and are not all sins diseases? and of all diseases that the greatest which we are not sensible of?] 3. Though yet it is specially to be made to the Prophets & Ministers of the Gospel. Lastly, He must be a person of fidelity, able to keep secret things that are revealed.

Cases of Con-  
science, lib. 1.  
cap. 1.

Many more suffrages for the usefulness of Confession, might be alledged of men of unquestioned authority in such cases as this: but now I shall come briefly to declare what is to be received, and what rejected in this Confession: 1. In speaking of the Original or Institution. 2. The Necessity. 3. The Tradition concerning it. 4. The due Practise of it. And the Church of *Rome* (however the Council of *Trent* hath determined it of Divine institution, to whose servile Canons we ascribe not so much as to the less servile judgment of some of the Learned Doctors of that Church) being divided in its opinion concerning the institution of it; the ancients of them generally denying any such Divine Precept; and they who come after the Council being obliged to hold up its Credit, affirming, we may without great danger or difficulty affirm, that Christ hath not in particular and precisely required any such Sacramental Confession: but by general Rules of Piety and Prudence inferring so much as a Council, and holy direction to assure our Salvation; which possibly may be obtained without, and more possibly be lost for want of it. For the Priest under the Gospel being the same to the uncleanness of the Soul, as was the Levitical Priest to the uncleanness and leprosie of the Body; it agreeth exactly with the Analogy between the Old and New Testament, that the like power be allowed to him in his Sphere, as was to the other, in his; and the like real, though not formal and express command. Yea, I could shew (were it a place Scholastically to handle this matter here) how according to the opinion of the Learned ancient Jews, the people under the Law did practise this Confession, and that upon opinion of a Precept in their Law. But I do not rest upon any other than what the Gospel affords, either in Letter, or Inclusively under those duties which it prescribes a Christian. Yet what *Solomon* hath in the *Proverbs*, I take not to be so much Legal as Evangelical. *He that covereth his sins, shall not prosper, but who so confesseth, and forsaketh them, shall have mercy.* And that of *Job*, clearing himself from the concealing of his sins, as a great crime, commends the revealing them, as a necessary act: *If I covered my transgression*

Prov. 28. 13.

Job 31. 33.



Levit. cap. 13.  
& 14.

Πάχιν τοῖς  
ἀμαρτήμασι ἢ  
ψυχῇ μᾶλλον  
ἢ σώματι  
ἢ τὸ  
σῶμα ἐν τοῖς  
νοσήμασι.  
Chryl. in c. 1.  
ad Rom. v. 26.

Levit. 5.  
v. 6.

Ego ut efficaci-  
bus scripturae  
testimonis et  
argumentis ir-  
refutabilibus  
non possum a  
Christianis  
vincere hanc  
confessionem;  
hanc (inquam)  
qualis nunc in  
usu est à Chri-  
sto aut etiam  
ab Apostolis  
esse institutam:  
ita piis omni-  
bus religiose  
observandam,  
censo; veluti  
saltem, ab Ec-  
clesiae proceri-  
bus non sine  
assensu Spiri-  
tus Divini  
inductam. E-  
rasm. in Exo-  
mologesi ap-  
ud Gesne-  
rum, Tom. 5.  
\* John 20, 23.

Matth. 16, 19.

sion as Adam, by hiding mine iniquity in my bosom: seem to be counsel in coun-  
mon with the Gospel, as having nothing ceremonial in them. And though  
that of *Leviticus* was truly Legal, as concerning outward alutions and  
pollutions, yet I see not how they, who allow any weight in the Type to  
infer the thing signified under the Gospel, can deny the like obligation in  
spiritual matters upon us, as was on the Jews, in respect of matters carnal.  
By that Law the polluted and diseased person was to appear before the  
Priest, he was to be examined by him, judged and sentenced, for clean or  
unclean; whole, or unsound. Sin is certainly the Leprosie of the soul: and  
'tis because men are led more by Sense than Faith, or by a monstrous Faith,  
rather than truly Evangelical, (which dispatches compendiously, more than  
safely, all duties of Religion in a word or single act) that they apprehend  
not the like danger or necessity in the case of their Souls, as Bodies; and  
therefore neglect the proper means conducing to their everlasting health.  
And this is yet more expressly propounded to us in the fifth Chapter of *Le-  
viticus*: where we read of many Errors and Offences to be redressed, and  
omitted. And that by bringing a Trespass-offering for the sin that he hath  
committed, a female from the flock; a Lamb or a Kid of the Goats for a Sin-  
offering, and the Priest shall make an attonement for him concerning his sin.  
Now the manner how, and the terms upon which, this attonement was to be  
made, are expressed in the words before, viz. *He shall confess that he hath sin-  
ned in that thing*. And to whom, to God privately? or to the Priest also,  
who was upon his Confession to make an attonement for him? There can  
be no doubt of the latter.

And in the Gospel, though I dare not, nor *Erasmus*, affirm any particular  
dicta Precept purposely delivered to enjoin this; yet by consequence and  
implication, it seems to be required, especially in some cases of apparent and  
grievous errors committed against the Faith and Holiness of the Gospel.  
For hither may the words of Christ well be drawn, whereby he commissi-  
oned his Apostles to act in his stead, himself leaving this world. \* *Who-  
ever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whosoever sins ye retain,  
they are retained*. Which words some Modern Interpreters restraining to the  
power of preaching the Gospel (though I confess that to be true) must pa-  
tiently suffer others to leave them, as they have their Predecessors, in that  
gloss: For first the Gospel might be preached by others as well as the Ap-  
ostles: And next, whatever Remission of sins attends the publication of  
the Gospel, is to be imputed, not simply and barely, either to the Preaching,  
or Hearing, or Believing the same; but, to the admitting by an effectual  
Faith all the things the Gospel requireth to be done by us. And as by the  
preaching of the Gospel in general and common, a general remission is al-  
so published: So by a particular application of the same unto the parti-  
cular and private Case of some one Person, is confirmed in particular the  
state of Grace or Impenitency to particular persons, according to the judg-  
ment of the Priest. And to this also pertaineth what Christ saith in the per-  
son of St. Peter, to all bearing this Office: *I will give unto thee the Keys  
of the Kingdom of Heaven, and whatsoever thou bindest on Earth shall be  
bound in Heaven, and whatsoever thou loosest on Earth, shall be loosed in Hea-  
ven*. Implying indeed a Power excommunicative of persons scandalous to  
the Faith and Church of Christ: But of the same power it is a branch, which  
is in every single Priest proceeding judiciously in the Court of Conscience  
to the binding, that is, declaring bound a sinner; or loosening, declaring  
him; at least, absolved from his sins, upon his repentance manifested to him.

Now

Now the Reasons obliging a man to this Confession upon Scripture grounds are these. First, That the Minister of God being according to his office not only to preach Christ and Repentance, and Faith, and remission of sins to all in general, but to apply and accommodate himself to the particular exigencies of men receiving, and diversly affected with the Gospel: which cannot possibly be but by a particular revelation made to him either from heaven, or the party to be judged. So that although it should be a sufficient discharge of the Priests part and office to make a general promulgation of the Gospel, and so declare that *whosoever believeth and repenteth shall be saved, but whosoever believeth not shall be damned*: Yet the hearer or receiver doth not thereby fully discharge his part, unless he understands more satisfactorily than ordinarily men can of themselves, their condition under the Gospel.

For secondly, By this Confession to another, a man comes better to understand and judge himself; as to his Faith and Manners. As no man can naturally, without the help of Art, see his own face, nor those eyes, which see all things see themselves, but by looking stedfastly in the eye of another, may. So can no man so well at least, no not by the glass of Gods word; discern those things in himself which are to be seen by anothers eye: and therefore it must needs be a means to bring the presumptuous to repentance; and the distrustful to a comfortable serenity of mind and consolation.

Thirdly, Confession is not only a sign, or an act of Contrition, but a proper means thereunto: For some there are who come to confess their sins, and have no true sense of them: others have a real sense, which is commonly called Attrition, being well assured and convicted by their own Consciences, they have done wickedly, and broke Gods sacred Laws, but there wanting the grace of ingenuous sorrow, and an affection out of Charity or Love to God, this sense will not avail to obtain pardon at Gods hands: wherefore by the wise Ministry of the Confessor, as he is called, he is to be wrought to a sorrow of love, and such as is conceived as well for the evil of sin in it self, as the evil of punishment it subjects him unto. Whence *Chrysostome* in a certain place speaketh thus, *I would have you have a sense of your errors by Confession, and shew your ingenuity of your selves*. For though it be a foul error to hold, as many of the Church of *Rome* do, that the very coming to Confession, or the customary sentence of the Priest, turneth Attrition into Contrition; *i. e.* imperfect; and of it self unprofitable sorrow, into saving; yet the joynt exhortations, not to be separated in such cases, do tend naturally to the more sincere conversion of a sinner unto God; upon the account of vertue it self, and the love of Good and of God.

Chrys. Tom.  
1. pag. 139.

Fourthly, Such Confession is a very notable awe and restraint upon the offender; it being too common with us here, to fear the eyes and ears of men more than of God: And infinite sins we daily commit, which if we were thoroughly perswaded should come to the knowledge of Man, we would not dare to do, though we be assured in general that they must be known to God. And 'tis an extream folly and direct untruth which some have entertained, That we must do things only upon the most perfect principles, to the most perfect ends. For 'tis better a man should abstain from drunkenness to save his purse, than not at all. And that a child should learn for fear of the Rod, than gain no knowledge at all.

But this leads to a fifth benefit which is the more perfect; For infinite there are who, upon necessity and compulsion, have begun a good work, which

they have concluded with delight, and greatest approbation, and with best circumstances.

Sixthly, Confession of sins to Man substituted ordinarily by God, is an excellent expedient to the preparing and enabling the Minister of God to relieve us upon our Death-bed. For how otherwise can he speak with judgment to us in our greatest Agony, when perhaps we cannot express our selves? but if we have formerly opened unto him the state of our Souls; he shall be much better enabled to assist in that our last conflict.

Lastly, According to the doctrine of them who hold it not only possible, but also a duty incumbent upon us, to get assurance of our Salvation, Confession of sins to the Spiritual Judge of souls must needs be very much approved: For setting aside extraordinary Revelations, and granting the little knowledge we have of the arbitrariness of God in the bestowing free Grace, and continuing the same which we so often forfeit, and lastly the natural affection every man hath to judge partially for himself, there doth not appear any so proper, outward, and ordinary means of coming to a true knowledge of his state of Grace and Salvation, as the Ministration of a Priest unto us in Confession; and his judgment of our state of favour or disfavour with God: Neither can any man so safely acquiesce, to the satisfaction of his doubtful Conscience, in the opinion he hath of himself, with out him, as with him. It is not to be denied, that a man may by the grace of God and his own repentance, heal his wounded soul of an habitual sin, and be really reconciled unto God, and find true and well-grounded peace of Conscience, without the assistance of a Ghostly Physician, as he may cure himself by Gods blessing, of a Fever or Consumption: Does this therefore make the use of a Physician superfluous, and his Prescriptions vain? No sure. But it is not the like case of his soul, as his body: For sense cannot there be so easily deceived, as his opinion of himself, as to his souls soundness. There is scarce any thing that is more common in spiritual matters, then that which is so rarely found in the condition of his body; *viz.* That a man should be very ill, and not know, or very well, and not find it manifestly in himself. It is requisite therefore, even for them who have truly repented before God, to be informed of their such recovery of Gods favour; or their not being purged from dead works to serve the living God.

The great impediment is a natural modesty, which peradventure the Devil may have an hand in: but this is occasioned rather for the rareness of it; as may be seen from the undauntedness of such as live in the Eastern and Western Churches, where Confession is so common.

It may be said, That the abuses are so gross, that the use seems inferior to it, by the ease and familiar absolutions given to notorious Offenders, and the great confidence these take to sin upon expectation of being acquitted. But to this it may be first replied, That unless abuses be inseparable from a thing in it self good and profitable, they are not sufficient to remove the use of it absolutely. And secondly, in those things that are notorious and to be discerned by one meanly instructed in the principles of Religion and common Morality, if the Spiritual Judge delivereth a corrupt sentence too favourable to the Penitent, he is able to judge himself better, and so ought to do. For a Confessor cannot determine that to be no sin, which the light of nature teaches to be, for he doth not judge of that, but of Religion. Nor can he determine against the first Principles of Religion, *viz.* that without repentance any sinner can be saved:

*Qui confiteri  
vult ut inveniat  
gratiam,  
querat Sacra-  
dotem. Aug.*

nor



nor, that a man doth repent who hath no sorrow for his sins ; or who ever at the time of a Formal absolution, nourisheth in his heart a resolution to return to the same sin he confesseth : So that in truth ; a man is commonly false first to himself, before he is mislead by others. And not Historically or Scholastically to dispute this, I shall only use that for an argument for it, which is often alledged against Confession, from the abuse and ill event of it ; for which *Nectarius* Bishop of *Constantinople* is said to have put it down: For had the thing been so evil, or unnecessary as some would have it, surely being once so judicially condemned and taken away, it could never so soon after have been restored, and continued all over those countries to this very day : So that it may seem either out of too great zeal of that Patriarch to repress scandals, or to satisfy the incensed multitude at the scandal given, that such a decree passed against it for a time : Though there is much to be said, that the Confession differed much from that here pleaded for ; for that was by custom published, but this under most sacred silence : which if any should reveal (being a condition of confessing so freely, that it should be concealed) I make no doubt but the perfidious Priest committeth as great a sin as likely he can hear from another ; and incurreth no less just censure of the Church, than is ordinarily inflicted upon persons convicted of scandalous sins. Saving, where (as our Church in her Canons hath soberly determined) the concealing of an offence against the Publick safety and peace, may bring a mans life in question. And whatever else the sin were, it alwayes turned more to the reproach of the discoverer, than the committer ; and so may it do as well before God as Man.

Constitut. and  
Canons, Can.  
113.

The exception against it as *Auricular* is ridiculous and childish, not to be answered seriously. It is no Penance, but a Favour. The Church doth require a man should open his Conscience to his Priest, it doth not command it to be done in so great secrecy, but as a favour to the Penitent ; who doth no less fulfill the mind of God, and the Church, if he proclaim his own sins : provided it be with penitence, and not impudence. Some other corruptions crept into this useful practise come next to be noted and removed, in speaking of the second Act or Effect of true Repentance, Satisfaction.

## CHAP. XXXIX.

*Of Satisfaction an Act of Repentance : Several kinds of Satisfaction. How Satisfaction upon Repentance agrees with Christs Satisfaction for Us. How Satisfaction of injuries, necessary, Against Indulgences and Purgatory.*

**T**H.E. Law and Justice are then said to be satisfied, when either we walk to exactly and conformably unto them: as to fulfill the primary intention of the Law-giver, in doing that which is just and equal: or the secondary intention of the Law-giver, *viz.* in suffering due punishment and chastisement upon the breach of it: And this is a satisfaction of the Law too, but not so perfect as the former, as being intended no otherwise than to secure the better the satisfying of it, in the Observation according to the first sense. Neither doth this, though fully suffered, make any man just or innocent; but acquits him from farther punishment. The former is wont to be called *Active Obedience*. The latter, *Passive*, but very improperly: For there is no Obedience truly so called, but what is *Active*. For all Obedience is an act of the Will: but passiveness is no act at all. 'Tis true, a free and willing submission to the punishment inflicted by the Law, hath somewhat of action in it, and so of obedience; but the suffering it self hath nothing of obedience; but is the effect of disobedience. And therefore much more reasonable is the distinction of satisfaction active, whereby we act according to the revealed will of the Legislator; and *Passive*, whereby we sustain the penalty threatened against the disobedient. And thus we in some sense satisfy the Law, when we have undergone all that was imposed upon us by it. This first part and most agreeable to the will of God, Christ, and no man else, absolutely fulfilled, that we any where read of. Every Article, and every Particle of the Law of God was fulfilled by him. And this was yet no more than he ought to do as man. Now what supererogation can be, what redundance to us, is hard to be understood, though confidently and zealously affirmed by many. This we can understand, this the Scriptures certify us, that Christ being not obnoxious to the Law, and *knowing no sin, was made sin for us; that we might be made the righteousness of God in him.* And from hence are derived all our comfort and other benefits by Christ: For whereas they say, that Christs passive Obedience (as they call it) did set us free from punishment, but not purchase life and glory to us, there seems to be a mis-apprehension of the condition of glory and immortality promised by God. *Do this* (saith Christ) *and ye shall live: i.e.* keep the Commandments. Again in the Book of the *Psalms*, and *St. Peter*, God saith: *The face of the Lord is against them that do evil to root out the remembrance of them from the earth.* And I know no middle state in the Scripture, between life and death; or glory and misery. For God hath promised everlasting happiness, not to them that by their

2 Cor. 5. 21.

Luke 10. 28.

Psalms 34. 16.  
1 Pet. 3. 12.

their Good works purchase or earn it, but to those who live according to his Law; and stand innocent before him from the violation both of affirmative and negative precepts therein contained. He that hath all these things remitted to him, is before God as if he had done all the duties of them exactly. He that is made partaker of Christs passive satisfaction doth thus stand acquitted, and by consequence hath a title and claim by virtue of the same to everlasting blifs: without the consideration of this active satisfaction or obedience.

Now to entertain such an Opinion of a mans private and personal satisfaction for his sins, as thereby to be able to claim any, either forgiveness of sins passed, or happiness to come, were to make the Cross of Christ of none effect: Yet because the Grace of God is not so free, that we should need do nothing more to be made partakers of the fruits of it, than passively to receive it; but Christian Religion, and Faith whereby we are justified and saved, is an active principle in us, leading to all Good works. Therefore it is required that we should do somewhat to put our selves into a capacity of the benefits of Christs Passion and Merits, whereby we are freely justified and saved: For as hath been said, we are not so freely justified by Grace, as to be absolved from all conditions, but so freely, as that the conditions of coming to, and receiving Christ, by whom we are saved, have no proportion with the salvation from him, in justice or common equity. Now I see nothing against such a satisfaction to be required of every true and faithful Christian, whereby he satisfies the conditions of the Covenant of free Grace in Christ; and yet never satisfies the Law it self, or for his sins which is absolutely effected by Christ: which agrees very well with what I find thus set down by one of our Church: *We believe that though Christ hath satisfied for the fault and punishment both eternal and temporal for our sins: yet our selves are bound to satisfy the commands of the Gospel tying us to repentance and amendment, and patient bearing of the Cross. Though we do not think that the doing of it, is that answers or expiates the judgment of God due to our sins: but only serves as a Condition subordinately required, that we may be partakers of Christs satisfaction.* Thus the Papists themselves sometimes describe satisfaction out of *Augustine*, *To be the cutting off the cause of sin, and the stopping of the wayes that suggest them:* and stick not to grant there is but *one satisfaction only to God, even that of Christ, and we do not properly satisfy, but only do something in respect whereof Christs satisfaction is applyed to us.* Satisfaction to God thus described, we confess, &c. And thus far the Fathers went, and generally no farther; however they are drawn to speak more derogatorily to the absolute satisfaction of Christ: For thus *† Isidore of Sevil*, following herein *St. Austin*, expresseth the matter: *Satisfaction is to exclude the causes and occasions of sinning; and no more to reiterate our sins.* So that all Acts tending to repentance and amendment of life being called satisfactions, we hold satisfactions to be necessary: And therefore Fastings, constant Prayers, Alms-deeds, punishing the Body outwardly, and denying things to it which may any way foment sin: yea, as the Ancients well said \*; *Seeing we have offended God in unlawful use of things lawful, to deny our selves the lawful use of the same:* Yea, any punishment laid upon us by our selves or others in order to the bringing us to repentance, and amending our lives, are much to be commended; the abuse which is easily separable from them, being removed; *viz.* That such things are in themselves satisfactory to God.

*Whites way to the Church.*  
9.40. nu.28.

† Isidor. Hispalen. lib. 6. Orig. cap. ult. Satisfactio est causa peccatorum & suggestiones excludere, & ultra peccatum non iterare.

\* Est quippe ordo necessarius, ut qui commisit illicita ab usu licitorum refrenat. In qua restrictione duo sunt consideranda. Satisfactio est necessitas Purgationis. Elred. Abbas Compend. Speculi Charitatis cap. 40.



But though these and the like, be not satisfactions of the justice, but rather the mercy of God. Yet there is a satisfaction which is proper and in some sense adequate to the offence committed: and this is to our brethren whom we have wronged and scandalized: And is either publick, when we have done any thing against the Church in general, by unchristian practices, as Murders, Sacrilege, Uncleaness, and such like. It was constantly required that such should satisfy the will of the Church, of which they were members; and undergo penalties or penances judged meet for such offences, and not be admitted into brotherly communion until they had suffered for their folly, to the content of the Church: A laudable necessary practice to be retained still, as well that the offender being put to publick shame for publick sins, might amend his life; and the Church may be preserved from the like contagion of sin. For notorious offenders being excluded from the Communion, were not restored to it until such satisfaction as this was made.

Another satisfaction, much of the same nature with this, is that which ought to be made to the utmost of our power, to them whom we have wronged by unjust words or deeds against them; which is necessary for the obtaining of Gods mercy and pardon to us. For if we must forgive the injuries done unto us, if we would have God forgive us our trespasses, ought we not much more to give every man his due in point of justice? The first seems to be a Law purely Evangelical; but the second Natural; supposed to the Gospel, as imperfect, yet most necessary: The Rule therefore amongst Divines is most certain, *The sin is not pardoned until the thing taken away be restored.* Now we take away a mans Good name, and we take away his Estate unjustly; and before we can say we have repented, we must be careful to our utmost to make this Satisfaction or Restitution. Where we take away a mans life, we cannot indeed ever satisfy the Party, no, though we should dedicate our own lives to him: yet so far as we can even outwardly humble our selves, by afflicting our bodies and purses; and especially endeavouring by extraordinary acts of bounty and Charity, to preserve the lives of such who stand in need of our assistance and relief. It was no satisfaction to him whose eye was put out, or tooth broken, to have the eye, or tooth of his Adversary to be struck out for it. Yet it shewed in the Moral sense thus much, that our utmost endeavour must not be wanting to make satisfaction to them we have wilfully spoiled, oppressed, defrauded, or otherwise injured. For otherwise, it doth not appear how a man dying conscious of such apparent injustices as these, can escape the damnation of hell: A new stupifying notion of Faith freely justifying, may perhaps be so ministered to him, as to quiet his Conscience, but save his Soul it cannot; where it is in a mans power to make recompence, and satisfy injuries and injustices.

But because man is naturally so partial unto himself, as for his ease and self-love, to make the best construction of Gods mercy inconditionate to him, and his sins against God: It was never in open notorious scandalous sins, permitted to the offender to judge for himself, but his actions were subject to Ecclesiastical censures, and proper punishments imposed upon him, to bring him, by those outward censures to inward remorse. Which severe censures, when they were observed to have a great effect upon the Penitent, were divers times remitted in part, lightened, and shortened by the favour of the Church, which were called therefore *Indulgences*: Following herein the precept and example of *St. Paul* in the like case, of the incestuous

*Non remittitur  
peccatum nisi  
restitatur ab-  
latum cum re-  
stitui potest.  
Aug. Epist. 34*

ruous *Corinthian* excommunicated out of the Church: who demonstrating sincere and extraordinary repentance for such his fact; St. *Paul* with a fatherly affection puts a stop to the utmost process of his Penance; saying, *Sufficient to such a man is this punishment which was inflicted of many. So that contrariwise, ye ought rather to forgive him, and comfort him, lest perhaps such a one should be swallowed up with over-much sorrow, &c.* Lett the punishment imposed on grievous offenders, meeting with a tender spirit; should break the heart rather than humble it; and cast him away, whom they intended to save thereby, a seasonable relaxation was alwayes at hand to the restauration of such an one. But as for that sense and gross abuse of Indulgence, whereby it is turned to remit sins aforehand, without due humiliation passed; and not only so, but to reach the torments supposed to be inflicted on Christians after this life in Purgatory, it is so absurd in it self, so unknown to all ancient Christian ages, so inconsistent with the doctrine of the Gospel, and nature of Repentance, that as it is impudence in that Church to pretend any of these to favour it, so is it stupidity in any person to lend any credit to it, or have any relyance upon it.

It is usually said, That few souls going out of this life so pure and thoroughly cleansed, as to be fit presently to enter into the holy place of heaven, where no unclean thing shall come; it is requisite there should remain some place to perfect the purgation of the Soul begun here. And that the power of the Church, especially the reputed Universal Father of it, extendeth in like manner to the mitigating and shortning of those purgative torments, as to the penances inflicted upon Penitents on earth. Truly, if they could but prove, what they as yet have not taken the boldness so much as to say: that they, or the Church inflicted the torments of Purgatory upon sinners there detained, I should be apt to believe they could take off the Rod they laid on: but never pretending to that, I marvel they should pretend to this, any more than they dare to the removal of a Fever by an indulgence only; because they judged the Party so ill affected to have suffered, and been sick long enough. There being not the least ground in holy Scripture to enable them so far, nor any argument out of Scripture to perswade themselves of this power, so great as temporal gain, and filthy cursed lucre, more like to damn the pretenders to it, then save the tormented out of misery.

But this is upon supposal made of such a Purgatory; but that it is only supposed and no real existence, appears from most ancient Tradition retained to this day in the Church of *Greece*: which indeed taking occasion from *Origen's* singular opinion, doth affirm a Purgation, and that by fire, at the last day of the general Resurrection, when by an unknown manner, God shall cause a purgation and change of the corruptible body of man into an incorruptible condition, more fit for heaven and glory. *Austin* sometimes doubted whether any such place or state after death were, wherein Souls were detained for their emendation and preparation for Heaven: He grants it possible, and that is all: but actually and positively so to be, he no where affirms; but saith expressly, *I do not therefore affirm, because I appose it not: But the supreme folly of cutting off scores, hundreds, and thousands of years of torments, by Indulgences upon earth, was such an imposture as could never enter into the head of any of the sober Ancients; and not to be endured amongst Christians.*

Many are the Suffrages of the Fathers to that of the word of God, *Blessed are the dead which dye in the Lord from henceforth: yea, saith the Spirit,*

2 Cor. 2. 6, 7.

Aug. Civ. Dei:  
lib. 21. c. 24.

Rev. 14. 13.

260

*that they may rest from their Labours, and their works do follow them.* Implying a direct and comfortable passage from this miserable, to that happy life in heaven. And whereas they say, That they who go to Purgatory may be said to dye in Christ, because they shall at length be delivered by Christ: How can that stand with such excessive pains there suffered, to which none on earth are equal either in degree or continuance? How can these wretched souls be said to rest from their labours and sorrows? Must they not make God a mocker of his servants in comforting them against their afflictions in this world, by telling them they shall one day be delivered from them, and go to greater in Purgatory? Besides, What grounds do they find in the Word of God, or the word of the primitive Fathers, which makes a twofold state in Christ: One of them who by Saintly lives pass immediately to bliss: Another of them who are in a middle state, and are partly miserable and partly blessed? But to their prime argument the Answer is easie. We are not generally purged wholly from sin, nor have we made full satisfaction of punishments for our sins in this Life, unless by Martyrdom, or some heroical and eminent Sanctity: Both are false which are here supposed. First, That Martyrdom for Christ, or the most holy and exemplary life lead here in this world, do so perfectly purge us, that we need not further cleansing. Again, it is denyed that true and sincere repentance acted in this life, both in forsaking sin, and in true conversion unto God, sufficeth not to purge us from all our sins in this life, as to the guilt and penalty of them, and the odious stain rendring the soul unaccepted to God, though men arrive not to the perfection of Martyrdom, or the eminencie of Sanctity attainable here, as St. John witnesseth: *But if we walk in the light as he is in the light, we have fellowship one with another, and the blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from all sin.* He doth not here intend to speak of the supreamest sanctity only, but of that general state of grace and holy life, in which whoever is, the blood of Jesus Christ cleanseth him from all his sins; and dying in that state, needs no more cleansing to make him capable of entring immediately into everlasting bliss, which is far from all torment, though not so consummate, as to be capable of no addition at the Resurrection, when the Body shall be re-united to the Soul.

1 John 1. 7.

Nor doth this take away what of prerogatives is justly due to Martyrdom or eminent Holiness in this Life; because there remains proper to them, first a greater measure of comfortable assurance of Gods favour and bliss hereafter; and a much greater and higher degree of glory when possessed, than inferiour degrees of holiness here can lay claim to. And this is sufficient encouragement, next to the pure intention of holiness it self, and Gods glory, to any Christian to abound in good works; knowing *that his labour is not in vain in the Lord.* And thus much of those we call *Aquivocal Sacraments*, and improper. For though all true Sacraments are ordinarily necessary to salvation; yet all things ordinarily necessary to salvation are not Sacraments; as Repentance, which in its nature consisting of true Contrition of heart, and conversion unto God, and thereby putting us into capacity of mercy from God, is not pretended to be a Sacrament until the Priest acteth his part towards the Penitent. And if Contrition thus understood, or Repentance be no Sacrament, surely neither can Confession or Satisfaction which are said to be parts of Repentance, be Sacraments: nothing being in the parts which may not be in the whole. But so moderate & sound a course hath our Church taken as to call them *Sacramentals*: as being above the order of general acts and duties of Piety, and not amounting to the dignity of the two proper ones, Baptism and the Eucharist.

Consecration  
of Arch-  
Bishops and  
Bishops.

CHAP.



## CHAP. XL

*Of Baptism. The Author, Form, Matter and Manner of Administration of it. The General necessity of it. The Efficacy in five things. Of Rebaptization that it is a prophanation but no evacuation of the former. Of the Character in Baptism.*

**M**ANY Acceptations are found of the word *Baptism* in Holy Scripture which I leave to others who have collected them: and betake my self to the thing it self commonly understood by it. And thus Baptism is a Sacrament of the New Testament, instituted by Christ, consisting of the outward signs of Water and the Word, and the inward Grace of Regeneration and remission of sins, and outward Communion with the Church of Christ: all which I conceive to be contained in our Church Catechism, where it is first described by its outward Sign to be, *Water wherein the Party is baptized in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.* And by its inward Grace to be, *A death unto sin and a new birth unto righteousness; for being by nature born in sin, we are hereby made the Children of Grace.*

This Sacrament then of baptism is said truly to succeed that of Circumcision: and to have the same Spiritual effect upon the Spiritual and inward man, which that had over the Outward. The agreement and difference between which two will sufficiently appear from the comparing of this, as we now shall explain it, with that, which we shall do by considering the Form, the Matter, The Subject, The Efficacy, and the Minister of Baptism.

The Form we have propounded to us by Christ, when he first instituted the same, and commanded his Disciples to go and *teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: teaching them to observe all things whatever I have commanded you.* From whence it doth appear that taking Baptism simply, for the Act, it consisteth in that form of words here prescribed by Christ; and the outward Action of baptizing with Water. But taken more Concretely and complexly for all things concurring to that Sacrament essentially, It is a Covenant made between God and Man, whereby is promised on Gods part remission of sins and salvation, and on mans part, Faith and Observation of the terms of the Gospel: as St. Mark more expressly hath it, *He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned.* This Covenant was typified by the Sacrament of Circumcision made between God and Abraham, with his seed; thus, *This is my Covenant which ye shall keep between me and you, and thy seed after thee: Every Man-child among you shall be circumcised, &c.* And this was yet more clearly prophesied of, by Ezekiel saying, *Then will I sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean from all your filthiness, and from all your Idols will I cleanse you.*

Mat. 28. 19.

Mar. 16. 16.  
Eph. 2. 12.

Gen. 17. 10.

Ezek. 36. 25

C c

And

And as with men, that is no sure Covenant which doth not consist of proper matter mutually passed from one Party to another : and of due form of words thereunto required ; So neither is that proper Baptism which makes no expresse or implicate stipulation between God and man, and that with that form of words and Action by Christ enjoined.

And the Matter of this Sacrament is expressed already to be water, by many places of Scripture : as *Mat. 3. 6, 11. Joh. 1. 26. Joh. 3. 23. Act. 8. 36, &c.* And having none other mentioned by Christ, we are not so much to argue presumptuously of insufficiency of that Element to effect so great matters, upon the soul, and thence conclude; That it is unlikely God should be so rigorous to exact indispensably a little water, or cause the party to perish in his sins : for 1. This way of reasoning holds no less against Gods severe imposition of Circumcision which was the cutting off of a small pitifull piece of Flesh : and yet that omitted, God threatneth positively to cut off the soul of the child from his people. 2. This takes away the Liberty and power of God to dispose of his Graces upon what terms he pleases : for the manner of conveying whereof, he may choose what means he pleases, though never so improbable to sense, to attain such ends ; that it may appear the vertue is not in the thing so much as God. 3. God in such Cases doth not so much tye himself, as tie us. He doth indeed oblige himself to those means himself hath ordained : but not confine so himself to them that he cannot or may not work the same effect without them : Yet as he so restrains that, he threatens wrath, and makes no promise at all, but upon our dutiful observation of such his Prescriptions. But as when a man, not by any wilful neglect, or disesteem of the usefulness of this Sacrament, shall, by invincible necessity, be detained from it, with a fervent desire to be partakers of it, God by his abundant Grace may supply the want of it. In like manner, where there is no proper natural water to be had, rather than the solemnity should wholly be omitted, and denied to one earnestly craving the same, Use may be made of that which comes nearest to it, so of a nature cleansing. But this needs farther determination to put out of doubt, than any private Doctour can give. For we read in Scripture of no other element (though in Ecclesiastical History we do) than water. And there appears no greater inconvenience or ill consequence for men to be brought to that extremity for want of natural water, than to want the general means of Christianity itself: or Children to die unbaptized.

Exod. 17. 14.  
Pallad. Laus.  
sic. Historiâ.

Rom. 6. 4.  
Col. 2. 12.  
Math. 3. 16.  
Act. 8. 38.

Exod. 29. 2.  
Levit. 14. 7.

But the manner of applying this water to the party baptized by Immersion or dipping into the water, or by Asperision or Sprinkling, and that thrice, or once only, is not much to be insisted upon. For though 'tis undeniable, that it was a general Ablution by sinking the Baptized into the water as St. Paul intimateth when he speaketh of *being buried with Christ in Baptism*, that as Christ was laid under the earth, after his death, so Christians under the water, and were buried unto sin : And other phrases of Scripture which speak of ascending out of the waters, and descending into the waters. Yet that any washing by asperision or sprinkling sufficed, appears from the Analogy between the Sacramental Purgations of the Old Law and the New : For as infinite places certifie us, the blood of the Sacrifices, and waters of Purification were to be sprinkled on the Persons therein concerned : And so the end of the Sacrament of Baptism is to signify, and conferr Grace on the baptized by such outward Elements : to which, the vertue of the Sacrament, not consisting in the nature of the thing

thing, but in the Institution of God, greater quantity can conduce no more then less, provided so small quantity be not taken, which should hide and hinder the significancy of the Elements. And besides, Gods rule being, *I will have mercy and not Sacrifice*, and never intending to save the Soul by such means as in common probability may destroy the Body, the condition of some persons being so frail and weak: and of some Climates so hard and hurtful, he is pleased to accept the most safe way, the substance of the duty being entirely observed. And such persons are not only Infants, but the Sick and very Aged too, who were baptized with water: and that upon a necessity of entering into the Kingdome. For could scarce any thing betray *Calvine* with his Followers such as *Perkins* and *Cartwright* more to suspicion of insolence and singularity than his seeking to elude the plain precept of Christ concerning Elemental, not Spiritual water and washing only, contrary to the universal consent of all Catholics, and Hereticks before him: as if he had taken the rise of his Fancy from these two famous Anabaptists *Balthazar* and *Satelare* in *Germany*: who reading in the Scripture one Ground of Pædobaptism to be Christs saying, *Suffer little Children to come unto me, for of them is the Kingdom of heaven*; interpreted the same of Children in Spirit, and not in Age: with the like probability both.

Joh. 3. 5. 6.

Cassand. Prefar. ad Anabaptist. Mat. 19. 13-14.

And of the subject of Baptism or the persons to be baptized, and capable of that Sacrament, this in sum may be said out of the Scripture, as the foundation of all, as even now out of *St. John*, *Unless a man be born of water and the Holy Ghost he shall not enter into the Kingdom of God*. And *St. Paul* to *Titus* saith, that *According to his mercy he saved us by the washing of Regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost*. And to the *Corinthians*: Cap. 12. *For by one Spirit we are all baptized into one Body, &c.* And the like is comprehended in that General Law of Christ given to his Disciples to be Executed, *Matthew* 28. 29. Now from these general Rules laid down by Christ in his word, a just and particular inference may be made to the entitling Children to a Right in this Sacrament: it being a Rule which holds no less in Divine, than Humane Laws, That where the Law doth not distinguish there men ought not to distinguish, or limit. For if it be alleadged that Instruction and Faith ought to go before this Sacrament, according to Christs Intention and institution in *St. Matthew*. It is sufficiently answer'd, that, seeing the Law General by which baptism is made necessary to Salvation, hath no exception or condition annexed to it, which may concern Infants, Infants are therein contained. And this implies an exemption from that naturally impossible preparation of Instruction, and Faith properly so called: And as *Calvin* well notes, Believing to infant-Baptism is no more requisite than working to their eating and drinking, by vertue of the Apostles precept, *If any will not work, neither should he eat*. Faith and repentance both are required necessarily of such who are capable of them, or able to oppose them: but of them who are not capable; and have no actual sin to be repented of, the Act of them who have the Care of them and Tuition, joyned with the passiveness or non-remittency of the Infants, found a capacity in them. But where a Personal power of Willing is found, there is exacted a personal knowledge and consent to that Sacrament. This will appear from those several reasons built upon the Scriptures.

Tit. 3. 5.

1 Cor. 12. 13

Calvin Instit.

2 Thef. 3. 10.

First, That the Primeft antiquity ever so understood the Scripture and practised accordingly. Not that Baptism was presently as now administred



to Children at their coming into the world : seeing Antiquity gives us many instances of such who were not baptized till they came to years of discretion, though they were born of Christian Parents : For some continued *Catecheumenes* together with them who were young, and Converted from Heathenism unto Christianity. Others, of purpose and design protracted the time of their baptism, upon an opinion that all their Actual as well as Original sins were washed away in Baptism ; and concluded they had the less to answer for, if they were baptized towards the latter end of their dayes. Yet though this abuse of Baptism prevailed not upon that opinion only, but upon the occasion which was taken of educating and instructing Infidels in the Faith, for some good time before they were baptized, which custome divers born of Christian Parents imitated ; yet we find none that the Church wilfully suffered to die without Baptism, who were descended of true believers, or had been competently instructed in the Faith of Christ : which was alwayes, according to Christs words, intended towards them who had None to resign them up to God, and compromise for their due perseverance in the Faith. So that there is not the least evidence of Authority ancient in the Church rejecting the baptism of children or denying them to be subjects capable of it. And none opposed the same until the year 1030 when *Guimund* Bishop of *Aversa* in *Campania* accused *Berengarius* Deacon of *Anjou*, for denying Infant-baptism ; though that opinion was not found directly to be *Berengarius's*. But about the year 1130 this Heresie began to discover it self in *France* and *Germany* and was Headed by *Peter Bruis* and *Henricus* his Scholar. From whom that Faction was called *Petrobrusians* and *Henricians* ; denying withal a Capacity of Childrens entring into the Kingdom of Heaven ; affirming, That only they who were baptized and believed could enter into Heaven. But the *Waldenses*, who succeeded them in many of their opinions, rejected this their Dogme ; and so the controversy ceased, until the year 1522. when one *Nicolas Stork* and *Thomas Muncer* (two desperately Phanatical men) stirred up this opinion, and other wicked fancies concerning Civil Government : wherein this Latter perished miserably. Yet this error was not so soon or easily suppressed, but spread farther and continued by the great industry and zeal of *Melchior Rinck* and *Balthazar Hebmüller* ; until about the year 1532 it received its complement from the tongue and hand of *Melchior Hofman*, a Leather-dresser of Germany ; and so hath been propagated to other places, and to this day. But not only did none of the ancients oppose Pedobaptism, but have declared and proved the use of it : As did *Irenæus*, *Tertullian*, *Origen*, *Cyprian*, *Augustine*, and others downward, were this a proper place to shew so much. We shall rather proceed to those Scriptural reasons inferring this.

Sliden Com-  
ment.

Τὸ πρῶτον  
ὡς τὸν ἁμαρ-  
τιῶν παρεκτι-  
κόν καὶ ζωοπι-  
δόν καὶ ἁγιασ-  
τικόν λατρεῖν, ὃ  
χωρὶς ἑδωκὸς  
ἔστιται, τὴν  
ἐκκλησίαν τῶν  
Ὀυρανίων.  
Athan. cont.  
Arian. pag.  
147. Tom 1.

Secondly, either all Children must be damned dying unbaptized, or they must have baptism : The consequent is plain from that Principle in Christian Religion, which Anabaptists have been constrained to deny, to uphold their other, *That all sin not washed away or expiated, exposes to damnation* : and the Principle in Christian Religion, is, That Children come into the world infected with Original sin : and therefore if there be no remedy against that provided by God, all Children of Christian Parents, which St. *Paul* says are Holy, are liable to eternal death, without remedy. Now there is no remedy but Christ ; and his death, and Passion are not communicated unto any but by outward Signs and Sacraments : And no other do we read of but this of Water in Baptism. And the invitation of Christ of infants

infants, in St. *Mathew* doth imply a capacity in them of Grace. For when Christ saith, *Suffer little Children to come unto me, and forbid them not, for of such is the Kingdom of God*: he doth not mock, meaning literally that Infants who are not able to go, or stand, should come unto him, on their own legs: So neither doth he mean in the spiritual sense, that Children who have neither reason nor Faith, should come unto him by Faith, before they be baptized; but be brought to him by the Faith of others, which may profit them who resist not, though they seek not that Grace.

Mat. 19.

Mar. 13. 14.

Thirdly, They that are of the Covenant, and of the Body of the Church really, ought also to be formal partakers of that Body; and this they only can obtain by being admitted solemnly into the congregation of Christs Faithful and Elect Church: As the children of the Israelites were of necessity to be admitted into the number of that Church, by circumcision, or be cut off in wrath, from them. For St. *Paul* telleth us, how the children of the Believers, are sanctified by their Parents. And how are they holy but by being separated from unbelievers, and solemnly dedicated to God by the Laver of Regeneration? And as in the same place the Apostle saith to the *Romans*, *If the first fruit be holy, the Lump is holy: and if the root be holy, so are the branches*; drawing this Literal to an Evangelical sense; and meaning thereby, that the Parent being of the Election, the Child is so: and being so, ought to receive the sign of Evangelical circumcision.

Gen. 17. 14.

1 Cor. 7. 14.

Fourthly, The Analogy and apt correspondence between the Sacrament of the Law called Circumcision, and that of the Gospel, warranteth this. For that is not true which they say against this, That the Precepts of the New Testament necessary to Salvation, are as clear as those under the Old: But this is not so clear as Circumcision: To which we answer, That this is as true, taking in the whole manifestation of Gods will: For the clearness of the Sacraments enjoined in the Old Testament do conduce to the clearness of them signified by them. And there needs nothing more be said for the clearing of the necessity of these, than to admit them to have succeeded these two in the Old Testament: And we find not such necessity particularly imposed upon us of receiving the Eucharist, as was upon the Israelites of receiving the Paschal Lamb, but general necessity, without determination of time or place, the Gospel expresseth unto us, upon the hope of salvation; which is sufficient.

The vertue and Efficacie of this Sacrament above-touched proves this farther: but it needs it self be proved according to those extravagant opinions brought by Modern Divines into the Church, that it is only a seal of our Faith, and eternal Favour of God in Predestinating us to Glory. As if, First, all (according to their judgements) that were baptized were ordained to Glory, and this were assured them by that Seal. Or Secondly, that God had Predestinated any to Life without the necessary means to it: Or that remission of sins Actual, and the expiation of Original, were not necessary to the entering into Life, or that God had so simply and absolutely ordained us to heaven, that he had not ordained these two as Means to obtain this. For what can be a more horrible prophanation of this Sacrament, then to say with one upon the *Galatians*? *We are born Christians if*

Perkins on Gal. 2. v. 15.

Οὐ μόνον τῶν παλίων ἀ-

μαρτυριῶν δωρεῖται τὴν χάριν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὴν ἐκείνην τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν ἐνδόξου ἀγαθῶν, καὶ τὴν δεσποτικὴν δαπάνην, καὶ τὴν ἀναστασιμὴν κοινῶς, καὶ οὕτως τὸ πνεῦμα δωρεῖται τὴν μαρτυρίαν χάριτος, καὶ οὕτως ἀπορῶν. Θεῷ, καὶ οὕτως οὐδὲ ἀλλὰ κληρονομίαν Θεοῦ, καὶ συγκληρονομίαν Χριστοῦ. Theod. Haret. Fabul. 5. 6. 2.

our Parents believe, and not made so in Baptism. Which is contrary to the Doctrine of our Catechism and the whole stream of Primitive Doctors of the Church, from whom we may Gather this threefold Effect of Baptism. First, it is not only a sign as the same Persons say, of our Covenant, but it is the Covenant it self made between God and Man. For God indeed doth make a Promise, but he maketh no Covenant otherwise than by Baptism. God made a Promise to *Abraham* that his seed should be blessed before Circumcision, but he made no Covenant with him, but by Circumcision; nor is any actually in the Covenant of Faith, but by being baptized. Doth not the Scripture expressly say, that God gave *Abraham* the Covenant of Circumcision. Circumcision then, was not only a Sign of that Covenant, (though that it were) but an Essential part of it. Circumcision therefore was a sign in a twofold sense; First, in respect of the Covenant under the Law; as words whereof the Covenant consists, are signs of the Will of the Covenanters, to the ear: and works outward are in like manner signs of the same to the Eye: which sort of signs are not distinct from the thing it signifies. For God Covenanted with *Abraham* that he should use those Ceremonies. Now this outward visible Covenant was a sign of an inward and invisible, relating to the righteousness of Faith, as *St. Paul* saith of *Abraham*: *And he received the Sign of Circumcision, a Seal of the Righteousness of Faith.* So that is the Second way in which Circumcision may be said to be a sign, viz. As the whole Sacramental Covenant of which it was a part, signified the Covenant of Faith: into which we are entred by Baptism, as the Jews into the other by Circumcision.

A Second effect of Baptism is, to wash away all sins, as well Original, as Actual: of which that Prophecy of *Zacharie* is generally understood. *In that day there shall be a fountain opened to the house of David, and to the inhabitants of Jerusalem; For sin and for uncleanness.* To which *St. Paul* agrees, in his Epistle to the *Ephesians* speaking of the Church: *That he might sanctifie it and cleanse it by the washing of water, by the word.* Where the Word sanctifieth the Water, and the water sanctifieth the Person: which it can no otherwise do then by washing off the sins of the Soul. As *St. Peter* hath it, *Not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good Conscience towards God:* That is, at the time of baptism, whereby the filth of the Spirit necessarily implied to make up the correspondence, is put away. And *St. Paul* telleth the *Corinthians*; *They were washed, they were Sanctified, viz. By Baptism.*

But whether Original sin be so far extinguished in the baptized, as no more remains should be found, is much doubted: to which we briefly and clearly answer from the distinction of Sins. For sometimes the Cause of sin is termed sin: Sometime the Effect of Sin is called Sin: whereas Sin is properly the Evil Act it self, or the omission of an act due from us. Original Sin in us is not so properly called Sin, as it was in *Adam* who actually sinned, and that with a consent of his own will. But it is rather the Effect of his Actual transgression which doth originally adhere to us, and is called sin upon this threefold account. First, because it is the necessary effect or consequence of *Adams* Sin: as we find *Moses* to speak in *Deuteronomy*. *And I took your sin the Calfe which ye made:* The Calfe was the fruit of their Sin, and not their sin it self. So is that evil Effect, the Sin Original, because it is the evil consequence of it. Secondly, It is Sin, because it doth partake of the nature of sin in one of the principal parts making up sin. They are two, The Obliquity of the Act, or Deformity and disagreement to the accurate Law of God, and



and the disobedience of the will, and pravity thereof: This latter, original sin as it was actual in *Adam*, had as well as the former; but so is it not with us. There can be no such disobedience in the Will, where there is no Will. There is no will in Infants besides the remote faculty it self; and therefore, all sin, yea all humane acts requiring consent of the Will, original sin cannot be sin in this sense: But taking sin for a dissonancy from the Law and Rule, as *St. John* doth; and that conformity as is justly required by the Law; certainly that Original depravation and corruption found generally in our natures at our first entrance into the World, may truly be called sin, because it makes us to differ so much from that God made us, and intended us to be. Thirdly, Original sin hath this likewise denominating it sin, that it is the cause of sin; that original inclination to sin being that which moves us all unto the actual commission of sin; which *St. Paul* surely aimeth at, where he saith, *Now then it is no more I that do it, but sin that dwelleth in me*: meaning by that, *sin dwelling in him*, the pronity natural which impelled him to sin, with such particular dissent and reluctancy of judgment, that he could scarce be accounted the principal author of it. To these we may add a fourth general event of this original pravity, *Viz.* An hatred and indignation conceived in God against the person so depraved, contrary to his institution and mind. Now Baptisms efficacy may have relation to all those, but not in like manner. For it washes away the filthiness of the soul, original and actual. Secondly, It reconciles to God, and obtains remission of sin. Thirdly, It doth not remove or wholly redress the depravation of the soul, and the evil tendencies and disposition of it to sin; which is the effect of *Adams* sin, and cause of our own actual transgressions. This is not destroyed by Baptism, but lurks in the soul; and like fewel is apt to take fire upon the least spark of temptations, which shall be cast into it from outward objects and occasions. And though it be so far done away that until such new risings and agitations of the mind, it be not imputed; yet upon such kindlings it putteth on a new guilt.

1 Joh. 3. 4.

Rom. 7. 17.

Another effect it hath in reference to actual sins. For first, by weakening though not destroying absolutely the principle of sin in us, a stop and curb is put to sin in its future progressions: And not only so, but proper means of which by and by are provided in Baptism for the resisting and putting away all actual sins too. For repentance being, according to the Doctrine of the Ancients, a *second plank* to save such as are shipwrackt, after Baptism, either in their holy Faith, or holy Life, doth effect this no otherwise than by virtue of that principle of life remaining in the soul, infused at first by Baptism. For, as Baptism hath no power to procure mercy at the hands of God towards them that sin after they are so washed and sprinkled, without repentance: So neither hath repentance sufficient vertue to restore us to innocency, and Gods favour, unless Baptism goes before; because all remission of sins depends upon the Covenant made in Baptism; which on our part is either to absolute holiness without sinning after Baptism, or to true Repentance for the same.

A third Effect of Baptism is our Regeneration and new birth, or being born again by this Water and the Holy Ghost. For as *St. Paul* saith, *According to his mercy he saved us, by the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost*.

Joh. 3.  
Tit. 3. 5.

A fourth Effect is an incorporating into the body of Christ, as well visible as invisible, which together with the former is declared in the form of

of

of baptism contained in our Liturgy, where it is said, *Seeing now, dearly Beloved, that this Child is regenerate and grafted into the body of Christs Church, let us give thanks, &c.* Which the Apostle intimates when he saith, *For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ, have put on Christ.*

Gal. 3. 27. And upon both these followeth a Fifth Effect, which is, an intitling the Baptized unto an inheritance in heaven. For as St. Paul saith, *If Children, then heirs: heirs of God, and joint heirs of Christ.*

Lastly, As we in baptism are all baptized into one body of Christ, so are we into one Spirit. For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body — saith St. Paul. And again, *There is one body, and one Spirit, even as ye are called in one body of your calling: One Lord, One Faith, One Baptism.* For the Baptism of our Saviour Christ being the Patern of ours; what in a more glorious, and visible manner followed upon his Baptism, in an inferiour manner attendeth our Baptism. It is said by St. Mark, *And straightway coming up out of the water, he saw the Heavens opened, and the Spirit like a dove descending upon him:* Which Spirit doth likewise upon the moving of those waters of New Life, descend and inspire the person Baptized. In which sense is St. Paul to be understood when he saith, *If any man have not the Spirit of Christ he is none of his:* That is, if he be not partaker of the Spirit given in common to all Christians, at the time of their Baptism.

Rom. 8. 9. From the foresaid necessity of Baptism, is inferred the opinion of the Minister of Baptism, making it a work in it self common to all Christians. For all things most necessary, as in Nature, so in Grace, are most easie and common. As therefore Water is the most necessary thing in the world, next to air, (without which no man can live so long as without water) to mans natural substance, (and therefore is made by God most common to all persons, and cheapest of all things to mans Life,) so doth it agree well with Gods divine Goodness in Religion, to make that most common, and freest to be attain'd, which he hath made so necessary to Life and Salvation.

The first thing that is necessary to our Salvation is the breath of Gods mouth (as the Scripture teaches us to speak) the word of God: which sanctifies both the person, and the Element of Baptism, Water; which is the Second. Therefore I make no great question but as it was free at the very first Publication of the Gospel, and so at this day is still, in some Cases, and in some manner, for those called *Lay-men*, to declare the word of God and instruct Unbelievers in the truth of the Gospel, (which afterward, it was restrained to the Sacerdotal Offices;) So upon the foundation of Faith before laid, by preaching, in all capable persons; and incapable, by others in whose power they are, that it is lawful for them who are no Priests to baptize. And the answer to this doth rather explain and confirm than deny it. For the Opposers of Lay-mens baptizing, say, That Preaching is twofold, Private, and Ministerial: and that a man may in Private, as Master of a Family, instruct others, but not Ministerially. The distinction it self is ill set together; for surely both are Ministerial Acts, and more especially, that which is denied to be so; Private Baptism: as having less of Visible power so to do; or authority: and therefore of an inferiour Ministration. But this is just the Case of Baptism. For we say not that Lay-men may baptize as Publick and Legal Ministers out of Office, but as Private ministers, and in extraordinary Cases. We bring the example

Psal. 33. 6.

example of *Zipporah* circumcising *Moses* his son, justifying the like power of Baptizing under the Gospel: And they reply nothing hereunto, but what makes more against themselves. For if she did it (as they say,) in the presence of her husband, when there was no need, she did it in haste, that she might prevent her husband; she did it in anger. And yet this Circumcision held good and was accepted: How much more might it have been accepted, if done by her more soberly, and seriously, as it ought by all whether Minister or otherwise? And that this Act of *Zipporah* was not so exorbitant in the manner of doing as vulgarly supposed, more learned Men have shewed at large.

Exod. 4. 28.

And secondly, That it was not so extraordinary, doth appear from the practice of the *Jews*, who, as *P. Fagius* hath observed upon *Deuteronomy* Cap. 10. v. 16. *do believe, if a Man be wanting, to whom it belongs; one Uncircumcised, as a Servant, a Woman (so not an Heathen or Infidel,) a Youth may circumcise an Infant.* Neither was Circumcision to be repeated made by what man soever, though an *Heathen* or *Infidel*. And in brief, We find no person excluded by the Catholick Church from doing this office, for one desiring it or capable otherwise of it, but a Mans self. And yet we are told by searchers into the ancient practice of the *Jews*, that a man might circumcise himself. And thus much of the First Proper and Generally necessary Sacrament to Salvation, Baptism; adding only one thing more for a conclusion, and that is, about the Repetition of Baptism, or Anabaptism. Of which prophanation of that solemn Sacrament, I find many really guilty; but not so much, nor upon those grounds they are Generally charged. For, I have not met with any that directly affirm it to be requisite or lawful to reiterate Baptism, though in fact they do so. For the *Novatians*, the *Donatists*, the *Arrians*, and they of Late years, who are called from the Renewing of their Baptism, *Anabaptists*, have none of them (that we find) declared it reasonable that Baptism once truly performed should be acted over again: but all these suppose it not done, and therefore they do it. It was always the opinion of the Catholick, as well as Heretical, and Schismatical Churches, That all outward words or washings sufficed not to the due effect of baptism. There were three several incapacities which render'd pretended baptism void, so far, that the Person so baptized was held obliged to be again baptized. The incapacity of the Minister or Baptizer: The incapacity of the Person or subject to be baptized: Thirdly, the incapacity of the Form used in Baptism. If the Minister had any time fallen from, or denied the Christian Faith, or was of impure and Scandalous manners, he was reputed by the *Novatians* and *Donatists* incapable of such a sacred Office; and consequently in that (though a Priest) did not effectually administer that Holy Sacrament, imagining that he who was so defiled himself could not by his *Ministration* cleanse another; and therefore he was baptized not as repeating former baptism, but as not being baptized at all. The *Arrians* being enemies to the second Person in the Trinity, and judging the Catholicks to be so too, in ascribing too much unto Christs divine nature, looked on the form of baptizing as corrupt and insufficient to such an end; and therefore thought another, necessary. And our modern Anabaptists as they are called, not thinking Infants capable of that Sacrament, for want of Faith and Repentance, (which they hold absolutely necessary to Salvation, and that in the properest sense) deny any effect to follow upon those Actions used. So that we see there are no proper Anabaptists; such I mean, who hold it so much as needful to baptize

Fagius in Deuteronom. C. 10. 16.



any persons above once. Though in Fact they stand guilty of this prophanation, upon the grounds of others not hard to be made Good against them, as we have against these last, shewing the Capacity children are in of receiving Baptism, as also that the unworthiness of the Person ministring Sacraments doth not impede the effect of those Sacraments, while he hath a proper subject to work upon; and observes the proper form required. Now this form, according as the *Arrians* excepted against it, doth depend upon the disputation of the Divine Nature of Christ, proper to another place.

Ephes. 4.

It may here be doubted, whether the zeal of some of the Ancients, but of most of the Schoolmen hath not too far transported them, who damn all such as repeat Baptism once rightly administer'd; it being impossible in their opinion, that Baptism should be twice acted, but the Former must be renounced: and truly, if Baptism once truly performed be renounced, that which follows is also renounced being in it self good: For there is but *One Baptism*, as *St. Paul* saith. But this can never be proved, as necessarily and perpetually true. They indeed, of whom now we have spoken; who were so engaged in heretical opinions and societies as to believe the imperfection and insufficiency of that Baptism they received, could not admit of another, but they must reject the first. But then, whether absolutely they rejected true Catholick Baptism, may be a doubt: For he only renounces his Baptism properly, who rejecteth the Form it self, and the Faith therein implied. And this is the *One Baptism* of which *St. Paul* is certainly to be understood: that is, necessarily *One* in nature, but that it should be also so *One* in number, as multiplied both should be made void, no reason is given. And surely *St. Paul* intended no such thing: though he may be said much less to have intended the multiplication of it. The more probable opinion therefore of the two is, That the Second Baptism is void rather than the first: As if two married persons being joyned together in Lawful Marrimony once, should presume a Second time to go, through the same Ceremony, it may be, only to confirm them in that state; this were to baffle and prophane such Ordinances, but it were not to make the former Vows and Rites void.

2 Cor. 1. 21,  
22.  
Eph. 1. 13, 14.  
Eph. 4. 30.

And for the reasons given against Iteration of Baptism, though I yield the Conclusion, that it ought not so to be, I do not hold them convincing, used to this purpose: Not that taken from the indelibility of that Character supposed to be imprinted in the soul, by that Sacrament. 'Tis true, Circumcision had a visible character made in the body, which could scarce be altered or removed: But that therefore, to answer this, there must be a proportionable impress on the soul, which is invisible, follows not. *St. Paul* calls Circumcision a sign, and a seal; and it is Baptism in a Metaphorical sense: And the Fathers, who many times mention such things, intended nothing more than an immutable Obligation on our part to God, and an infallible communication of Gods grace to them who duly are partakers of his Sacraments. It is also true, a Man can be born but once spiritually, as naturally; and therefore superfluous and prophane are all attempts to a Regeneration a second time; the principles of spiritual life being preserved intire in themselves, though in a way to be extinguished upon pertinacy in sin, and dying in impenitency. And for those places of Scripture where *St. Paul* tells us, we are *sealed by Gods spirit*, alledged, to prove that we have a Character made in Baptism upon us; it is evident, that they are to be understood not of the ordinary Baptism, by Water, but

but the extraordinary, of the Holy Ghost, sometimes preventing Baptism; as appears in the *Acts* more than once: Other reasons out of Scripture brought to this purpose do prove only that to repeat Baptism is needless, but not damnable. For the *Ethiopians*, who are reported to Baptize themselves once a year, on the same day that Christ was Baptized, do it as the History of them tells, not so much implying an invalidity in one Baptism, as a convenience to bring to mind the Baptism of Christ, on *Epiphany*; perhaps reckoning the precept of Christ given to Communicate in Remembrance of him, might hold to the obliging them to repeat Baptism in remembrance of his Baptism.

A<sup>ct</sup>. 10. 41.Brewerwoods  
Enquiry.

## CHAP. XLI.

*Of the second Principal Sacrament of the Gospel the Eucharist. Its names. Its parts Internal and External. Its matter, Bread and Wine: And the necessity of them. Of Leavened and Unleavened Bread. Of Breaking the Bread in the Sacrament.*

VV

E now come to the Second most proper and necessary Sacrament, known by several names, as that of *The Supper of the Lord*, in our Church Catechisms; not because our Lord Christ made his Supper of it, or ever intended we should, but be-

cause at his Last Supper upon the Paschal Lamb, and the conclusion of it, he instituted this, for his Apostles, and all Faithful peoples spiritual benefit, as a Spiritual Repast or Supper, nourishing them to eternal Life. In answer to which, we read of the Promise of Christ in the Revelations, *Behold I stand at the door and Knock: if any man hear my voice and open the door, I will come into him and will Sup with him and he with me.* And St. Paul more expressly, to the *Corinthians*: *When ye come together therefore into one place, this is not to eat the Lords Supper*; distinguishing hereby this Sacred Supper from the more ordinary communion which those first Christians had in their Charitable meetings to eat and drink together to their mutual edification and comfort. From whence their Cavils seem to be groundless, who with some scorn reject this name in use much amongst the Reformed, fearing somewhat derogatory to those Sacred Mysteries.

Rev. 3. 20.

1 Cor. 11. 20.

And upon the same grounds likewise, do they shun the name of the *Lords Table*, lest the word *Altar*, which seems to them more sacred, should be less accounted of. And yet without reason; For surely where St. Paul calls those holy Mysteries, *The Table of the Lord*, he speaketh not properly but Metonymically; not of the Material Table, on which they were placed, but of the Adjuncts which were the Sacramental Elements: Though it be plain that from this Supper of the Lord, the Table furnished with it, took its

1 Cor. 13. 21.

denomination of *the Lords*. And that not only in Scriptures, but amongst Primitive writers too. And, *Altar* of the Lord it was called, only Metaphorically, not properly, by both: no otherwise than the Lords day was called by way of Analogy, *The Sabbath day*.

From the Form used at the celebration of those Mysteries, it was called *Eucharist*, which was *Thanksgiving*, as *Mathew* 26. 26, 27. From the Effect, which was double, *Communion* with Christ, and with the Members of Christs Body, the Faithful, it was termed *Communion*, *1 Cor*: 10. 16. From the Matter of which it consisted, The Body, and Blood of Christ. *Corin*: *ibid*. And many more less considerable appellations have been received in the Church, to be passed over in this short view: wherein we are rather to enquire into the Nature of it in these Particulars, *viz*: 1. The Author. 2. The Matter. 3. The Form. 4. The Ends and Effects.

For the Author, It is, without controversy, Christ himself; the histories of the Gospels plainly so affirming, *Mat*. 26. 26. *Mar*. 14. 22. *Luk*. 22. 19. And St. Paul to the *Corinthians*. *1 Epist*. 11. 23. It having nothing herein peculiar to it: it being necessary to all Sacraments, so properly called, that they be Instituted of God, or Christ: as is above proved.

The Greatest contention of all, is concerning the Subject-matter of this Blessed Sacrament, not in a few words to be opened, or composed. The clearest way to proceed in this disquisition is, First, to consider the External Part, and then the Internal. The External are the Signs or Elements appointed by Christ, to insinuate and represent unto us his Passion; or as his own express words are, to bring to remembrance his death and Passion. *Luk*. 22. 19. *This do in remembrance of me*. And what is here only recorded by the Evangelists to have been said of the Bread; St. Paul affirmeth to have been likewise spoken of the Cup, *Do this as often as ye drink it in remembrance of me*: declaring unto us the use, and end of the Institution of these Signs. *1 Cor*. 11-25. But before we go any further, it will be necessary in our way to distinguish the twofold most principal and common acceptation of the word *Sacrament*, here: For sometimes it is taken Complexly, for the whole ministration of the Lords Supper: and at other times, only for the Material Part of it: which again is sometimes taken for the External or signifying Part, the Elements; and sometimes for the Internal, or things by them signified, which are the Body and Blood of Christ, and that not simply and absolutely, but as under the consideration of his Bitter death and Passion, and that for our sakes.

The Elemental and External parts of this Sacrament are to be considered two ways: First, before the celebration, or consecration of the same; and then after. First then it is generally agreed to, on all sides, that our Saviour Christ took natural Bread, and natural Wine, most commonly in use in those Countreys; and therefore in all reason, this ought to be a constant, binding prescription to all that minister, and use that Sacrament; and not to vary from the very kind used by him when ever it can with any tolerable care and cost be obtained. But seeing that Christ in all probability, without any scrupulous choice of Wheat or Rye, or Barley or any one single Grain, made use of that which was in ordinary use at Meals amongst them, and there being no express word, which of these he took, there appears no reason why any one, of which Bread may be made, for the service and life of Man, may not be taken to this purpose: And especially



especially, considering that the end of the Institution, which is said to be the representing of Christs death and Passion, and the affecting us thereby, may no less be performed by the one sort than the other. Yet where the constant practice of the Church, confirmed by positive Injunctions, hath determined the kind, it can be no ways free or safe for any unnecessarily to vary from that. It is of much greater difficulty to determine, What is to be done in the cases of such, both extreme Northern, as well as Southern people, who have no such Grain amongst them as we have mentioned. For, 'tis very hard to acknowledg an ordinary necessity of this blessed Sacrament to the having life spiritual in us, to the comfort of our souls, to the strengthening of our Faith, to the resisting the temptations of the Devil; and, in fine, to the salvation of our souls, and yet supposing what St. Paul testifieth, that God would have all men to be saved, there should be a natural incapacity of the means of the ordinary means of Salvation. And considering withal, that Bread may be easily taken, not for that only which is made of our common Corn, but for that also which supplies the use, and fulfils the natural ends of Bread, and bears sufficient proportion to the agreements between the Natural and Spiritual Bread, as St. Paul hath stated it, *We being many, are one bread: for we are all partakers of that one bread.* In the first, he compares the conjunction of Christians in this communion, with the union of the many several grains into one bread: And so though the parts constituting one Loaf, be more distinct than they which may concur to the compounding one body of this *Supplemental* bread; yet are the Parts distinguishable so far as to truly denominate that body a Compound. In the latter Analogy of St. Pauls, saying, *We are all partakers of that one Bread,* that is, as we all in the Communion partake of one Loaf outwardly, so we inwardly all partake of that one Bread of God, that came down from heaven, Christ Jesus; no less in some other one body, than in proper bread; I say, (not absolutely determining that so actually it is, but) that the Representation makes no such difference, but so it may be.

And this, methinks, they should be most inclinable to, who religiously observe the mixing of water in the other Element, Wine: which otherwise must needs infinitely and inextricably perplex the minds of the Consecrator, and Communicant both. For it being not at all determined in nature, what the Schools in general determine, viz: that so much water may be mixed with wine, till it ceaseth to be truly wine, and yet the Element capable of effectual consecration; I say, it being not determinable in nature by the acutest judgement, precisely, what quantity of water destroyeth a quantity of wine; it may so fall out, that by the undue mixture of water, the wine ceases to be wine: and then, what becomes of that Sacrament which they say essentially, and indispensably requires wine? It is very hard and presumptuous to affirm that none but natural (no artificial water drawn from distillations) have any efficacy in baptism, especially if they have a cleansing nature with them; as all, or most in some degree have: seeing they may signify the same for which Natural water was ordained. For otherwise, we may say, that Hot water, being in some sense artificial, was not in any case to be used to such ends. And distilled waters are certainly not absolutely made, for then there might be more reason to exclude it, but is that Elemental water of which the natural Body doth consist; though not distilling naturally but præternaturally from the body, out of which it is forced; and retaining more mixture than the common sort doth. And so

Scaliger exercit. 292. ¶ 4.

Plerosque nos vidimus frumenti usum et vini penitus ignorantes. Ammian: Marcellinus Lib: 14. Cap. 12.

1 Tim. 2. 4.

1 Cor. 10. 17.

Ejusmodi esse debet Eucharistia, ut multa in unum redigantur. Aug. Tract. 26. in Joann.

Eusebius De-  
monst. Evan-  
gel.

so may we affirm much more of Bread, that the commonly known Bread is that which should be preferred without all doubt, yea not without greatest scruple should be neglected; but when that which is in place, and common use amongst some Nations, seems to them more natural, and ours more unnatural and artificial, doth there not appear great reason to admit that? Or can we imagine that Christ whom we find the least superstitious or scrupulous of all men of his age, in things not directly limited by a Law, but of themselves indifferent, would not have followed the customs and opinions of men in such Regions, had he conversed with them? Is it not a reason rendred by the Ancients, and that a very sufficient too, against the Perpetuity and Universality of the Jews worship; that all Nations could not possibly be concerned in it, or obliged by it, because of an incapacity they were in by the extreme distance from *Jerusalem*, the place of principal worship, to fulfil the Laws and Precepts of it? And will not it, or at least may it not be alledged as strongly against the proper Catholickness of Christian Religion, that the Laws thereof, and that one of the most solemn and necessary, cannot be observed by all Nations? It will be said, That such things as are so necessarily required, may be imported from other places. Very true. And surely where it may, it ought. But to make any Countrey, which Gods Providence extendeth it self to, of it self incapable of receiving as good Christians, as any place in the World; or to make the Religion of Christians to depend on Merchandizing necessarily, is more than in modesty can be said, or by reason maintained.

Neither doth the condemnation of the Heresie of the *Aquarii* of old, or such as solemnized this Sacrament with water alone, condemn absolutely the use of all other Liquors besides Wine in it; because they condemned the use of all besides Water in that Sacrament, contrary to Christs Institution. Christ, without doubt, celebrated with proper wholesome Wine, of the fruit of the Vine: And this argues sufficiently that the like is to be used, and none other, where it is attainable. And the argument of the Schoolmen which say, That neither Sider nor Perry, nor liquor pressed out of Raisins, nor Vinegar, nor such like are apt matter for consecration, because they are not proper Wine, may be allowed, taking apt for proper and convenient; but scarce if taken for Possible; as if they were not *susceptible* of Sacramental consecration, where they are in common use. And though Vinegar seems to draw neerest to the nature of Wine, and in that respect more apt than other Liquors, yet in this it is more unapt, because it is the drink of no people. And yet *Alexander Alensis* granteth that in some Regions they consecrate altogether of Vinegar, because to them Wine in its pure nature cannot be brought. This they understand rather of Wine degenerated of it self, into such an *acidity* or sownness, than of that which is studiously made so. But if nothing which art hath counterfeited and adulterated can be received as the matter of this Sacrament, how many Sacraments in Christendom would be absolutely void, and Communicants deluded of their expectations? And seeing in the corruptions of Wine by other ingredients, as well as Water, the Casuists determine that it ceases then only to be capable of this sacred use when it retains its nature, not otherwise; but cannot determine possibly when the nature first begins to change to a destruction: What infinite and grievous suspitions and scruples must evermore afflict the minds of Communicants upon conceit that the matter they so receive may have suffered such strange kind and degrees of

of composition that the nature of Wine is really lost, and an artificial liquor not much to the eye or vulgar taste discernible, taken in its stead; to the nulling of the effects of the Sacrament, and much worse, where such a specific Conversion of the Elements into Christs Body and Blood is maintained, and received with answerable Faith and worship. The distinction of Material and Formal Idolatry (of which we may hereafter speak) little redressing that monstrous evil.

And if we are not so indispensably and absolutely tied to the natures of things in this Action, much less ought there to be such warm and uncharitable contentions about the condition, form, or qualities of those Elements which in no manner change the nature of them: as Leavening, or Unleavening; or forming the bread after the common use, or in such manner as may be thought least subject to prophanation in making the Bread into several Cakes or Wafers, which though it nulleth not the Sacrament, yet it corrupteth the Institution and End both, in some measure. For First, it is certain Christ celebrated on solid, usual bread; and why should we upon private imaginations, next to vain Superstition, introduce another order than Christ pitched on, and amend by fine contrivances what he but rudely laid down, as we irreverently must suppose? Again, It doth seem more than an indifferent Ceremonie, which, according to St. *Paul*, and after him the Fathers, signified the Unity of Christ, and his Members, and of his members one with another by that one Sacramental Body visibly representing, and exhibiting invisibly Christ in that One Bread. And lastly, That Ceremony of breaking Bread, so much practised by Primitive Christians even in this Sacrament, and thereby expressing Christs own proper Body broken for our sins, a very Fruitful, Reasonable, and significant Action, is altogether laid aside; to the great injury of Christs institution and Christians edification. Surely, if any thing, this is to make our selves wiser than Christ, and to be subtilter and more zealous for his Majesty than he would have us: which cannot be wiped off by that common refuge and reserve at pinching objections, *viz*: The Power of the Church. For the Church has no Right (what ever Power it may have) to make alterations at pleasure, upon no better grounds than were at the first known and neglected, in Sacramental things; though the nature of the Sacrament may remain inviolate. For seeing the Sacramental Signs were ordained by Christ to call to remembrance the particulars as well as general of Christs Passion, and the manner, as well as the thing it self; to the intent that the more deep and lively impression might be made thereof in our Souls, to pare off, (out of presumption of the Churches Power, and more reverent ministration and participation thereof,) the Ceremonies so immediately and significantly expressing the End of it, and used by Christ himself, and for ought doth appear, for several Ages after, is to invade the Rights, and call in question the Wisdom of Christ himself. And surely then, The Breaking of Bread signifying the violence offered to Christs Body, and the Pourcing out the Wine intimating the shedding of his Blood for us, nothing can be more useful; and therefore to abrogate these, and invent and impose others upon pretences not unknown, but rejected at the first Institution, argues more superstitious presumption than sober Devotion.



## CHAP. XLII.

*Of the things signified in the Sacrament of the Eucharist, the Body and Blood of Christ. How they are present in the Eucharist. Sacramentally Present, a vain invention. All Presence either Corporal or Spiritual. Of the Real Presence of the Signs and things signified. The Real Presence of the Signs necessarily infer the Presence of the Substance of Bread and Wine. Signs and thing signified always distinct.*

**B**UT thus far of the Signs: The things internal and signified are yet of greater importance to our Faith and worship, *viz.* the Body and Blood of Christ: The several Disputes about which we shall reduce to these two General Heads briefly to be explained. First, the manner of Existence of them in the Eucharist: And next the manner of Participation: which two do mutually illustrate one another. For as to the Real Presence it self, I find no such real difference which may deserve discussion. For surely, If Christ or his Body and Blood be at all Present in this Sacrament, they are really present; For imaginary fictitious presence is no better than a Mockery unworthy of any Philosopher to admit, and much more Divine. Whatsoever is, Really is, or not all; according to this account: And therefore to say, We All agree in the thing, though we differ in the Manner of Christs Presence, is to say no more, and to draw no neerer at all to the composing of this difference, than we may have any common Philosopher to joyn with us, upon this granted that Christ is Present there, for that must needs be really. So that no Christian can deny the Real Presence absolutely, but must presently interpret himself in some peculiar sense to himself. And they that do so, are wont to begin with a distinction of *Sacramental*, and *Corporal*, or as some, *Natural* Presence. For Sacramental Presence, (it being not at all heard of or known in Logick, or Nature, nor to be explained by any thing parallel to it, out of this Mystery it self,) who can be the better for it? Who can understand what is meant by it, before he be resolved of the thing most of all question'd, *viz.* What is Sacramental Presence? For unless we be cut off here, and must not at all enquire, What it is to be Sacramentally Present, but take the notion at a venture, and presume we know what in truth we do not, we shall be as hard put to it as before. For Sacramentally to be present doth not at all express the manner, unless, as some seem to mean by it such a Mystical presence that we know not what to make of, (and

(and in this acceptation every unknown thing should create a new kind of being) but imply all senses possible to a Sacrament. So that if a man holds Christs body to be in the Sacrament Bodily and naturally, this is certainly a Sacramentally; and, If he holds it to be there Spiritually, it is likewise Sacramentally; and so whatever other way we can reasonably conceive to be in the Sacrament it must be Sacramentally: Sacramental Presence being (as is said) no one kind of Presence, but common to all possible to the Eucharist, if not to nature it self.

It will be more needful to distinguish between Christs *Corporal Presence* and Christ *Corporally Present*; and there is good ground for to do so. For if *Presence* be as *Thomas* defines it, 1. *Qu. 8. Ar. 1. 2. The communication of one thing with another; so many waies as a Body imparts it self to another, so many may it be said to be Present to it.* And these waies are commonly resolved to be two. First by immediate contact and conjunction. Secondly by a Virtual or Effectual communication with it, the Substance it self continuing remote. So that though Christs body should be determined to one certain place in Heaven; yet may it by its vertue communicate it self to us in the Sacrament, and be said to be Present really, though not Corporally, after the manner of bodies in their natural state, by contiguity.

And what we now say of the Subject of this Sacrament will hold no less in the Case of Participation of Christs Body and Blood in the Eucharist. For as Christs Body may be said to be really though not Corporally Present and immediately: So may it be said to be received Really, and not Phantastically only, though not Corporally after the manner that other bodies are received. For they that affirm that Christs body is Corporally, Sacramentally, received, do say, if not what they know not themselves, yet what no body but themselves can apprehend: For either these terms are really distinct, or Not. If they be not, then are they either superfluous, or at most explicatory one of another: but this latter cannot be said, because *Sacramentally* is more obscure than *Corporally*; and *Corporally* signifies a much grosser degree of Presence than the Framers of this distinction will admit to agree with these Divine Mysteries. If they be distinct, whence shall we fetch the nature of this Sacramental Presence? whenas there is nothing to be found in Nature to resemble or explain it; but it must be described by it self: And *Sacramentally Present* is no more than to be present in the Sacrament: But what it is to be present in the Sacrament, or how a thing may be said to be present in the Sacrament otherwise than in other Cases, we shall ever be to seek, and consequently never learn. Therefore we must be constrained at length to reduce this large and unintelligible *Presence Sacramental* to one of the two old sorts of the *Presence of Influence* only, or *Presence of Substance* it self [or *Suppositum*.] So that either the Influence only of Christs Body and Blood should be found in the Eucharist, and the vertue of them be therein communicated unto us: or the very natural Substance also.

We have hitherto spoken of the Presence it self precisely taken from its Causes and manner external: For according to Philosophers there is a *Modus Essentialis*, and a *Modus Accidental*. The Essential manner is simply to be, after the intrinsique nature of a thing: as the intrinsique nature and manner of a Body is to be Corporally and of a Spirit to be Spiritually: that is, As a Body, and as a Spirit. But as a Body ordinarily and naturally palpable and visible may remain a true real Body and yet not be seen, or felt; so may a Spirit

remain a Spirit in substance, and yet appear as a Body. So that it is possible, Christs Body may be present corporally in the essentials and formal nature of a Body, and yet not appear in the accidental or separable formalities of a Body; which are actually to be seen and felt at a competent distance. These I call accidental, because they may be wanting, as well by reason of the defect of the senses which should perceive them, as of the sensibleness of such objects: For a Divine power may take away the one, as well as the other, by impeding the sense: though seeing the very nature and essence of a Body consisteth in being extended, and quantitative, it cannot be conceived how a Divine Power can divide them which mutually constitute one another; though it may render them imperceptible to outward sense. And so Christs Body may be in the Eucharist, so far corporally as to have all real and essential modifications of a Body: but not so Corporally as to appear in the proper forms of a Body. But granting, or supposing rather, that Christs Body were in this latter sense present in the Sacrament, there appears no great reason, why this should be called a Sacramental Presence more than that presence when he was with his Disciples at Supper; and as the Scripture saith, Vanished out of their sight: that is as the word and sense import, not translating his Body suddenly to another place but disappearing in that place, or ceasing to be seen by them: answerable to the contrary power shewn in his sudden appearing without any previous Act, and *standing in the midst of them*, before they could be aware of it, or suppose any such thing: which was occasion of their great Affrightment and amazement, supposing him to be a Spirit.

Luk. 24. 31.

V. 36.

37.

But it is one thing to be *Possibly* and another *Actually* so to be. And yet farther, Actually for Christs Body and Blood so to be present; and to be so Present as there should remain nothing substantial or material besides them; and the Signs to be changed into the things signified by them, absolutely and totally, the shew or Accident only excepted. So that the Question is double, First, Whether those Substances of Bread and Wine remain after consecration really the same they were before, or be totally abolished? Secondly, It is inquired, not so much whether Christs Body and Blood be really present in the Sacrament, but whether it be really the Sacrament it self, as it must necessarily be, if so be that they be in such manner really present, as there remains no other substance besides them.

For the former of these, the knowledge of the Real Presence of Signs, Bread and Wine, do exceedingly conduce to the understanding of the Real Presence of the Body and Blood of Christ under, or through those Signs. And it should seem that the Roman Advocates of the New sense of a Real Presence of Christs Body and Blood, proceed not in the proper and natural method, rightly to found their Doctrine. For, as according to them, there must be in order of nature, though not of time, a *Defition* or abolition of the Elemental substances, before there can succeed those Divine substances; so should they have first by sound and sufficient arguments, proved the destruction of the preceeding *Bodies*, and then have inferred the succeeding. But on the contrary, They first presume on the Second (upon what grounds we shall hereafter see) *viz*: That Christs Body is so really subsisting there; and then conclude, that the Elements are not there subsistent. For he that holds that the Sacramental Signs do not exclude the Body and Blood of Christ, doth likewise hold that the Body and Blood



Blood of Christ are not inconsistent with the Real Presence of the Elements. It must not be denied that those texts of Scripture which are commonly alleadged to Parallel Christs words, and consequently to give a more favourable sense than that of Transubstantiation; do not exactly fit the Case. For when the Scripture saith, *Christ is a Door, or Christ is a Vine, or a Lamb*, it is not the same formally, as to say, that a Lamb is Christ, or a Door, or a Vine is Christ. Yet if that rigour must be observed in Scripture Propositions to have them true, that without a Trope or Figure, they must be understood, otherwise, we must be reproached to deny Scripture; the foresaid speeches must as necessarily inferr a Transubstantiation of Christ into the Nature of a Door, or Vine, or Lamb; as his bare words at the Celebration, do inferr a Transubstantiation of the Elements into his Nature. And no apparence of disparity can be here shown; if so be Christs Literal meaning must be here urged as they do.

Now, That the Signs which were before, are Really Present in the Sacrament after Consecration, doth appear from the most Essential thing to a Sacrament. A Sacrament we have defined to be a Visible Sign, with *Austin* and infinite others: I say, a Visible and Real Sign, and not *visibly, Apparently* or *Seemingly* a Sign: or a Sign of a Sign, as the deluding *Species* remaining after supposed Transubstantiation, are said to be. And it is an Impossible thing, as is before shewed in the general treating of Sacraments, that the Sign should be the thing signified. For if some Sign could be the thing signified; then, something signified should be a Sign: and so both wayes the Relate and Cor-relate should be the same too; and two should be one, and one should be two: and if this may be, what may not be? or at least, said to be? For as to the instances given, That in some Cases a thing may be a Sign, and the thing signified, it hath been showed how defective they are, in that they are a Sign of the same nature perhaps, or rather some qualification of it, and not of the same thing numerically, as the individual Sign in the Lords Supper is believed to be of that it is. Therefore from hence they are put to their choice, Whether of the two they will suffer: the loss of the Sacrament, or the absence of Christs Body in their sense. For not only the nature of the thing now expressed, require Sacramental Signs as well as the thing signified, but the manifold Authorities of the Ancientest of the Greek and Latin Fathers have for this reason, called the Sacramental Elements, *Signs, Figures, Representations, Types, Antitypes* of Christs Body and Blood: as might at large be shewed, our Adversaries not denying it. But what answer do they make to them? The Modern Greeks as Cardinal *Bessario* (who is herein followed by some more modern than himself) Latinizing; answer, confessing that the Fathers often so speak, but (say they) they speak only of the Bread and Wine before Consecration, and not after. Here is some wit in this shuffle and evasion, but no truth at all. For before Dedication and Consecration, they are not Signs, or Figures, or Antitypes at all: They have no more relation to the Body and Blood of Christ, than the like Elements at our Common tables: and therefore they must be understood to speak of them after Consecration. But the Answer of the Scholastical managers of this controversy in the Latin Church, shows less modesty and no more truth. For they say, St. *Austin* who calls the consecrated Elements, a *Figure of Christs Body*: *spake not of every empty Figure, but of a Figure of a thing really present.* All this we grant willingly, viz: that the Signs Sacramental are not Signs of things future, or Absent: This is nothing at all to the

*Bessario De  
Eucharist. Sa-  
cramento.*

*Aug. in Psal.  
3.*

Contra Ad-  
mant. C. 12.

Fisher Jes.

purpose. And the Second answer is notoriously and boldly false, saying, That St. *Austin* might there speak as *Manichee*, who denied the Real Body of Christ: For it was in confutation of *Manicheans*. And of *Tertullians* words, who likewise calls the consecrate Elements, Signs, they make nonsense; joyning head and tail together, that they may really signifie nothing, least they should signify that for which we alleadg them. *Tertullian* saies, *Hoc est Corpus meum: Id est, Figura Corporis mei. Figura Corporis mei*, saies one (after his greater Doctors) is referred not unto *Corpus meum*, as an explication thereof, but unto *Hoc* in this manner: *Hoc; id est, Figura Corporis mei, est Corpus meum. i. e. This; that is, the Figure of my Body, is my Body.* If it be not sufficient conviction of their Errour, and confusion, that they are driven to such unnatural tossing of mens words against common sense and Grammar, and having so done, to affect nothing but what is directly false or unintelligible, (as this Scholie is making the Figure and the Body the very same thing,) I confesse I have nothing to say.

For this is the subject we have at present in hand, That the Sign and thing signified must by eternal necessity, be distinct: but this opinion of Transubstantiation destroys this: and destroying this, destroys the Sacrament. For whereas they say, That the remaining *Species* supply the place of the Substance abolished, and are Signs: This cannot consist with the impossibility of such Accidents without a subject; in that, contrary to their definition, they should stick, and not stick to a thing; in that they are Accidents, their nature requires that they should have a subject; and the nature of this mutation requires they should have none. And whereas they argue, That what any Creature can do, the Creatour can much more do; and therefore, if the Creature can sustain Accidents, the Creatour God Almighty can. I answer, If the Creature could sustain Accidents without a subject, then doubtless could God the Creatour; but doth it follow that because the Creature can be a subject to them, therefore the Creatour can also? All that a Creature can *Do*, the Creatour can do: but all that the Creature can *Suffer*, I trow the Creatour cannot: But to be the subject to Accidents, is a Passion, and imperfection, and no Action: and therefore nothing can be concluded from hence. Therefore they proceed one strain higher, not doubting to say, That, what the Creature can do by its Passive Capacity, the Creatour can do by his Active, which if it did not imply a contradiction in nature itself, I should easily grant: but this it doth. For first, it is to make an Accident, a Substance: For tis the nature of a Substance, to subsist of it self without the aid or support of any other thing, distinct from it. Not that the Secondary being can subsist without the First, God himself, but without any thing Created. And therefore seeing that Substance it self cannot continue in its Being without Gods omnipotent hand supporting it; this doth equalize the nature of Accidents to that of Substance, in that it supposeth that Accidents, by a divine power, may subsist of themselves, as well as Substance. For substance cannot subsist at all without a Divine power: and thus Accidents by a Divine power should be of the nature of Substance: but such confusion and havock in nature, to bring in an unnatural Dogm, is no ways to be admitted, not out of any defect in the Divine Power, but an incapacity of the Creature to be so order'd, against its nature.

And as this Condition of *Species* subsisting or existing separately of themselves, is contrary to their nature: So the significativeness of these *Species* is contrary to Christs Intention, and Institution; which were to make a repre-

representation of his death and passion, by Bread and Wine, and not by the *Similitudes* of Bread and Wine. And this is to be noted, That when the Ancient Fathers both Greek and Latin do affirm that Christs Body or Blood are present under the *Species* and Forms of Bread and Wine, they do not mean such *Species* as the Schools of *Aristotle* have introduced, (for I find not that they took any notice of them,) distinct from the subject to which they relate : but they took them in a more plain sense, for the thing it self so affected and formed : and *Under the Species*, signified with them as much as *Under the Kinds* of Bread and Wine, Christs Body was present. And they never destroyed the Sacrament it self, to give an extraordinary Being to the Body of Christ therein.

## CHAP. XLIII.

### *The principal Reasons for Transubstantiation, answered.*

**A**ND If this be once made good, That there is a Proper Sacrament remaining after Consecration; it will be much less difficulty to agree upon the manner of Christs presence in the Sacrament. For the doubt will not be so much about the Concomitance, and co-existence of it with the Sacramental Signs ; as, Whether that which we See with our eyes, and touch, and taste, be properly, and not denominatively and Figuratively only, the Body of Christ. And in effect, Whether it be the very Sacrament it self, or whether only in the Sacrament. The Doctrine of the Church of Rome determines not only that *There it is* ; but directly and expressly, *This it is* : and this we deny, as that which indeed must include such a Transubstantiation as is by them affirmed, and the chiefest grounds whereof we are now to examine.

And First from Scripture, they are wont to argue, and that from the Old Testament : where are recorded many Types and Figures of Christ, and particularly, his Passion : which were no less, if not much more clear than the representations in the Eucharist ; if Christ himself be not there otherwise than Figuratively. For the Paschal Lamb slain, seems to represent Christs Passion more Lively and expressly than the Sacramental Elements : Therefore, if that the Sacraments of the Gospel might exceed them of the Law, it is necessary that what was done there Figuratively only, should be properly and really performed in our Sacraments. *Ans.* But first, supposing Transubstantiation, is Christ more clearly in the Sacrament, than if there were no such thing ? Or can the Sacrament of the Gospel be said to be more clear for this, when in truth it is more Mystical and abstruse ? But though it be not more clear to the sense or Reason, yet it is in it self more really present : For otherwise the Legal Sacrament must have been only a Figure of Christs Body, and not of the Body it self. But the answer of *Bertram* to this about eight hundred years

*Bellarmin : Lib.  
1. Cap. 3.  
De Sacram.  
Eucharist.*

*Bertramus.*

ago,



ago, is sufficient to this purpose; that both the Paschal Lamb, and the Sacramental Elements both Figured and represented Christs body: The former Christs Body future, and its Passion; and the other Instant, (as at the Institution) or Part, and compleated. So that in truth, a great preeminence there is in the Sacraments of the New Testament, above them of the Old: which is the thing contended for. But Christ was really received in both.

Joh. 6. 48.  
53.  
54.

The next Argument taken from Christs words in the sixth of *John*: where he saith amongst many other things, *I am the Bread of Life*. And again, *Verily, Verily, Except ye eat the Flesh of the Son of Man, and drink his Blood, ye have no life in you. For my Flesh is meat indeed, and my Blood is drink indeed*: Is answer'd two ways. First, from a consent on both sides by some of the Learnedest, That Christ spake not of a Sacramental Eating and Drinking of him; but Ordinary, in receiving him by Faith, preached: But because, as many on both sides affirm that he pointed at the Eucharist, in these words, therefore I think it most reasonable, and equal to take in both senses: and that Christ intended the receiving of him by Faith in the word preached, and in the Eucharist too. And though Christs Flesh be meat indeed, and his Blood drink indeed, it doth not follow at all, that it is *properly* so: For things Metaphorically such, are really, though not Properly. And Christ doth not say, *Caro mea est verus cibus*, or *Sanguis meus verus est potus*. i. e. My Flesh is true meat, or Proper: My Blood is true Drink: but My Flesh is Meat indeed, and my Blood is drink indeed: that is, verily and really. And besides the difference before intimated between these expressions and that at the Celebration of the Eucharist when he calls the Bread his Body, is very great, especially with the precise stickers to the Letter: For according to these, Christ Transubstantiated Bread into his Body: but here, according to the same Rule of interpretation, he should convert his Body into Bread: the words being alike operative: But if Christ did at no time make a Transubstantiation of his Flesh, or body into bread, though he affirmed his Body to be bread: What reason is there we should believe upon no better grounds, than he affirming bread to be his Body, should thereby change it into his proper Body?

A Third principal Argument is taken from the words of Christ at the Celebration, *viz: This is my Body*, and *This is my Blood*. And upon the proper acceptation of these words, they make no doubt to put to silence all seeming oppositions, and contradictions, and impossibilities in nature. For be it (say they) how it will, Christ saying it, who is truth it self, no doubt is to be made of it: For as they teach the vulgar to speak, If Christ should say that this stone were his Body, we ought to believe it. All which is granted. But we must distinguish, as all sober men do, between *Loquela* and *Sermo*. He that rehearset a certain number of Articulate words doth *Loqui* or *Λαλῆν*: but he only who doth deliver the word conceived in his mind (which is his meaning) at his mouth, doth *Sermocinari* or *Λέγειν*. Now if it can be proved by any certain Circumstance, that Christ meant these words in a proper sense, and not improper, in which he delivered no small part of his doctrine in the Gospel, we have done; the Controversy is at an end; we are to lay our hands on our mouths and freely to conclude with them. But until this be better evinced what make they with so many zealous professions of their believing of Christ, or protestations against others that herein they believe not Christ?

It

It becomes then the principal doubt of all, not what were Christs words but what was the drift and purpose of them. And surely they must needs grant this to be worthily doubted of, when they consider how sundry of their eminent Doctors do yield such an Indifferency in the words as that they are capable of both senses: as might easily be made apparent: But saying that We ought to take the Scriptures always literally where it will consist with the analogy of Faith, they say no more than we: But if it happens (as here it doth) that our Analogy of Faith differs from theirs, what are we the neerer? For our Faith tells us, Christs words were spiritual as well here as in St. *John*; where he expressly testifies so much saying, *The words that I speak unto you, they are spirit, and they are life*: that is, spiritually and not properly to be understood: And *Literal sense* we understand two ways, First, as being the same as the prime signification of the words according to common use: And this *Literal sense* we deny of these words. But affirm them literally to be taken, taking *Literal*, for that which by the same words was immediately and primarily intended by the speaker, in which way all Metaphorical speeches are Literally to be taken. For he that says of a vicious man, *He is a Beast*, doth literally mean that he is of beastly qualities, and not the very nature of a Beast. So that Metaphorical and *Literal* are not opposite, but Metaphorical and Natural, and Natural and Spiritual.

Joh. 6. 63.

We say then, That this Proposition as in the Eucharist, is Metaphorical, and yet *Literal*. But it is a weak and spiteful slander to say, That because we say this, therefore we hold that Christs Body is only Metaphorically and Figuratively in the Eucharist: For we profess it to be really and properly, and really and properly received in the Sacrament; and not as they would fain persuade the World of us, imaginarily only: But the figurativeness is not so much in the *Presence* of Christ, as the *Predication* of Christ, of the visible Elements: We say, plainly, the Elements are Christ only Figuratively, and improperly: and as St. *Ambrose* hath it (or rather had it before a false Cause here, as elsewhere, constrained men to foul practises.) *After Consecration that which was, remains, and yet is changed into another.* It retains its nature, it is changed to its name, to its use, and ends, and effects; and these are sufficient.

Ambros. de  
Sacrament.  
Lib. 4. C. 4.

The Fathers who are alledged to prove Christ spake here properly, do speak of many changes made in the Elements; but then they do as often deny the substance to be changed; sometimes they say, *The Nature is changed*: but we know *Nature* is sometimes used more largely than to imply the very *Being* and *Essence* it self. We say commonly, *Such a man is quite of another nature from what he was.* We do not mean his very *Essence* or *Being* is changed; but his condition. It is said in the first Book of *Samuel*, that after his anointing to the Kingdom, *God gave Saul another heart.*

1 Sam. 10. v.

I hope not in substance but in disposition. But it is neerer to our Case what St. *Paul* saith of Christ and us, in his Epistle to the *Ephesians*, *We are members of his body, of his flesh, and of his bones.* Can any thing be more expressly affirmed than this, to signify a corporeal unity and identity with Christ, if the Verb Copulative *Are*, must here be taken Substantively, as they say *Is* must in these words, *This Is my Body*? As they profess with much ardour and zeal they will believe Christ, say he what he please, and be the thing never so contrary to our common sense and reason, so do we: And no less do we believe St. *Paul* speaking by the same spirit: This he hath said, and therefore we must not dispute, but believe.

Eph. 5. 30.

He

He hath said as plainly as words can make it, that we are the very flesh of Christ, and the bones of Christ: and that he cannot be understood of the same in Kind; but number is manifest from his argument when he saith, *No man ever hated his own flesh*; but as his flesh is anothers in nature, we know there is nothing more common. Now the like, if not same interpretation will satisfy the Scripture in one place and other.

And not only so, but the Fathers who are urged for the literal signification of the words rather than Literal sense of the Author of them, speak diverse times of a Real change of the foresaid Elements; but saying the same in other cases as in the holy *Chrysm* after Benediction; and specially the water of Baptism, we would have one give meaning to the other. And the Modern Greeks who are arrived at higher expressions and sense than their forefathers, yet when occasion serves can affirm the substance of Bread and wine to remain; and would never fully receive the term [transubstantiation] Transubstantiation, as the Latins do: which declare how much they suspect an Evil sense in the Roman Church. Again, as they are defective in their characterizing this change to that degree, so are they excessive, according to the Latins opinions, in ascribing too great a change upon Consecration. For they make no such distinction, as the other between Nature or substance, and the Accidents. And they deny as much, there remains any Accidents, as any substance of Bread: wherein they seem to take Christ more Literally than the Papists. For if (as they give out) we must take Christ at his word, and hold him hard to the Letter, we must and ought to do it no less in reference to the Accidents than the Substance: For Christ made no distinction, and then why should we? By virtue therefore of his words the Accidents must be changed as well as the Substance. And so in truth we believe: and to make our meaning clear will allow no effect of Christs words upon the one, which we will not upon the other. And if they oppose sense to discriminate the Cases, saying, that we see and feel that the *Specieses* and Accidents are the same: We must tell them in their own words and that without fraud or dissimulation, that we believe Christ rather than our own senses: And were it not so, yet we cannot tell that they are the same individual Accidents which were before consecration, though like them; and appearing so to be. And I could never as yet meet their reason worth the noting or remembring, which should move them to be lead by their senses to interpret Christs words, when he saith Positively and with the same Verb Substantive, *This Cup IS the New Testament in my blood*; and commands them to *drink the Cup*; and to deny their senses when he saith, *This is my Body*.

Luk. 22. 20.  
V. 17.

1 Cor. 11. 27.

Aug. de Do-  
ctrina Christi.

Nam Sacra-  
mentum Alep-  
tionis suscipe-  
re dignatus est  
Christus et  
quando cir-  
cumcissus est et

quando baptizatus est: et potest Sacramentum adoptionis: Adoptio nuncupari, sicut Sacramentum corporis et sanguinis, jus quod est in pane et poculo consecrato, Corpus et sanguinem dicimus. Non quod proprie corpus ejus sit panis, et poculum sanguinis: Sed quod in se Mysterium corporis ejus et sanguinis ejus continent. Hinc et ipse Dominus Benedixit panem et Calicem quem Discipulis tradidit, corpus et sanguinem ejus vocavit. Quocirca, sicut Christi fideles Sacramentum Corporis et sanguinis ejus accipientes Corpus et sanguinem ejus recte dicuntur accipere, &c. Facundus Hermianensis Pro. 3. Capitulis Lib. 10. Cap. 5.

And as reasonles and frivolous are their Answers to St. *Augustine* who affirms it to be a Prophane and blasphemous sense to understand Christ, of his proper Body, and to eat it: For can any thing be more Elusorie and ridiculous than to *Scholie* on him with a *That is, As meat is bought and sold in the Shambles?*

But if it be possible to express any thing more clearly, *Facundus Hermianensis*, and that as set forth by *Syrmondus*, doth both expound St. *Augustine* meaning and our Saviour Christs, yet more irrefragably; writing

against



against the *Eutichians* in these words, *For Christ vouchsafed to take on him the Sacrament of Adoption, both at his Circumcision and at his Baptism: and the Sacrament of Adoption may be called Adoption, as the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ, which is the Bread and Cup Consecrated, we call his Body and Blood: not that properly his body is Bread, or his Blood the Cup, but that they contain in them the Mystery of the Body and Blood of him. Whence our Lord himself called the Blessed Bread and Cup which he delivered to his Disciples, his Body and his Blood. Wherefore as Christian believers taking the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of him, are said truly to take the Body and Blood of Christ: So Christ when he took the Sacrament of Adoption of Children, might truly be said to take the Adoption of Children.* Thus he, and *Syrmundus* in his notes upon this place doth confess these to be very harsh expressions like unto some of *St. Austins* there mentioned.

And to our urging the name *fruit of the Vine* given to the Consecrated substance; and thence concluding that the real nature of Wine remains; they answer that it is not unusual to give the name to a thing as a little before it was, or seems to be: Which we deny not: And by the parity of reason, return upon them to their loss: For we know it is not unusual for a thing to be called by the name, not which is proper to its nature, but which it represents. And to the eye of Faith, the consecrated Elements are the Body and Blood of Christ: and so may not unaptly be so called by those whose senses are exercised (as the Apostle speaks) to discern both good and evil though in nature they be far otherwise. Heb. 5.

Some indeed (as I conceive) have been but too free of the Figures in this question, supposing that the very word *Est*, or *Is* must not be taken in its proper sense, but stand for as much as *Significat*, *Signifies*: but this is without ground in Grammar or Divinity. For he that saith, as *St. Paul* is interpreted to speak, *Nero is a Lion*, doth not lay the agreement upon *Est* or *Is*, but upon the subject, *Nero*: For the *Verb Substantive* is equally indifferent to Comparative, and Proper Speeches: and continues so, applied to any thing. The Signification or Similitude lies in the two Terms, *Nero* and a *Lion*; and *Bread* and *Wine*, and the *Body* and *Blood* of Christ. Now there being no difference between a Similitude and a Metaphor, but that the one is at large, and in many words, what the other is in one: To say *Christ is a Lamb* or *This (which is bread) is Christ*, is no more than to say, *Christ is as a Lamb*: and *Bread is as Christs Body*: For the many agreements between the natural and Spiritual senses. The one, and that principal, is that of Sacrifice which ought here to be briefly explained. 2 Tim. 4.17.

## CHAP. XLIV.

*Of the Sacrifice of the Altar. What is a Sacrifice. Conditions necessary to a Sacrament. How, and in what sense there is a Sacrifice in the Eucharist.*

**G**R E A T contentions have been about the Sacrifice of the Altar; and perhaps, though with just Cause, yet not so great as is generally believed. For these two Terms do much illustrate one the other. For neither is the Altar upon which Christians offer, properly an Altar, any more then (as is said before) the Lords-Day now observed is properly a Sabbath, nor is the Sacrifice thereon performed properly a Sacrifice. Some will have that only truly called a Sacrifice which consisted of living Creatures slain and offered to God, and to this sense do I most incline. For there must be in all things some one thing which is as a Rule and Law and gives denomination to others, according as they agree with it. Now if all offerings to God, as fine Flower, and fruits of the Earth, be called a Sacrifice in an equal sense to the most proper, then have we no Rule to go by in Judging of Sacrifices. And therefore *Gulielmus Parisiensis* who rejecteth the former acceptation because we Read in *Leviticus* 20. of a *Sacrifice of fine Flower*: and *Exodus* 31. *Sweet Smell, seemeth* himselfe to erre, as he saith others do in the Notion of a Sacrifice. For either these things and such-like were more properly called *Oblations* than *Sacrifices*, or when they were called *Sacrifices* they were so called because of the Proper bloody Sacrifice as the principal thing, to which they were adjuncts.

*Dixerunt aliqui, gula Sacrificium non est nisi de Animalibus: et erraverunt in hoc, &c.*  
*Guliel. Parisien. de Legib. Cap. 3.*

*Leffius de Ju. & Justit.*

*Deut. 12. 13. 14.*

*Jacobus Bolduc. de Ecclesia ante Legem Lib. 11.*

*Mat. 23. 19.*

Five things are said to be required to constitute a *Sacrifice*. 1 A Proper Minister, who is the Priest. *Heb. 5.* Secondly, the Matter must be sensible. 3. The form of that matter must be changed, and that after the nature of it. Thirdly, It must be directed and devoted to a Good end, God. And fifthly, It must be offered in a proper place. But not all these are certain, and constantly true. For *Cain* and *Abel*, and *Noah* and *Abraham*, and the rest under the Law offered proper Sacrifices; but that they had peculiar Temples, or Altars, is not true. For until that injunction of God in *Deuteronomie*, *Take heed to thy selfe that thou offer not thy burnt-offerings in every place that thou seest: But in the place which the Lord shall choose, &c.* it was free for the servants of God, to offer their Sacrifice upon any place they should think fit: and make Altars at their pleasures. though I am not ignorant that mystical *Bolducius* is of another mind without solid grounds. But afterward, the Altar (as Christ intimateth in the Gospel) *Sanctified the Gift*, so far, that it was not accepted but upon that which God had ordained for Sacrifices, or offerings to him. The case is not altogether so now under the Gospel, that Christians should be absolutely confined to the Publique Altars (as they may be called) appointed to the Eucharist: For we do not read that ever the Apostles so Celebrated, but have great presumptions to the Contrary. Nor doth it in like manner appear

appear in the Gospel, that those places, on which they did Celebrate, were preserved from all Secular uses; as we do in the Law, that Altars there were. Yet so much ought all, who are good Christians, condescend to the immemoriall practise of the Church separating all such sacred things from common and vulgar uses, and requiring to celebrate upon the Reputed and appointed Altar, that I make question, whether any Sacrifice, not so offered, through contempt or fullness, can be either so acceptable to God or profitable to our selves as in the other received way.

And there want not as learned men who denie that Consumption is necessary to a true Sacrifice: And I am sure the Roman Cause so requires: unless in this state, they will make Christ passible, and Corruptible; though I know they have many a Sorry shift to evade this too.

Now for brevity sake, to omit many things incident to this dispute, and to apply the Notion of Sacrifice to the Actions in the Eucharist; If we take Sacrifice in *Melancthon's* sense, from which *Calvin* doth not much vary, *For every act and thing devoted to God, whereby we give him honour*, there are Sacrifices enough to be found in the Eucharist: And there are many known senses of Sacrifice given to God, admitted by Protestants. But passing all them over, the Question here must be stated concerning this Sacrifice, as it was concerning the Body of Christ: Not whether there Really it is, but whether it really and properly be Predicated of the matter of the Sacrament; and that in as proper a sense, as Christs Body was offered upon the Cross: This we deny, acknowledging only these three things, which fully satisfie the expressions of the Ancient, calling the *Host* an *Incrment Sacrifice*. First, because here we call to remembrance Christs sacrifice upon the Crosse, according as he Instituted and required that at our hands, saying, *Do this in remembrance of me*. Secondly, as it is a Sacrifice Rememorative, so is it a Sacrifice Representative, insinuating and signifying unto as the death and Passion of Christ: and not as common signes and advertences only to bring to mind: or as *Gulielmus Parisiensis* hath it, *like a String tyed about the finger* to put a man in remembrance, and no more; but also to informe the Iudgment, and confirm and encrease the Faith of the Receiver. Thirdly, it is a Sacrifice Representative to God as well as to Man: For though nothing can lie hid from him, or be forgotten by him, yet taking things as he hath been pleased to express them unto us, after the manner of Men; he, by the offering of this Sacrifice and the devout worship there performed to God, is moved to behold, consider, and accept the true Sacrifice which Christ made for us in offering himselfe for us: As it was by Gods own appointment in the Rainbow put for a signe between him and Man of the Covenant for not drowning the earth. *And the bow* (saith the Scripture) *shall be in the cloud, and I will look upon it, that I may remember the everlasting Covenant between God and every living creature, of all flesh that is upon the earth*. In like manner and much more effectually, may we say that the Action of the Eucharist presents to God the Sacrifice of Christs death, and mediation made by him for mankind, especially those that are immediately concerned in that Sacrament: from which Metonymical Sacrifice, what Great and rich benefits may we not expect? Thus is the Host a Sacrifice, but not essentially as the sacrifices of the Law, or Christs offering himself; but Analogically, and Metonymically, by vertue of the Sacrifice of Christ; and through whose vertue the benefits of Christs death, and Passion are made over unto the worthy Communicants agreeably to Christs Institution; and the Title given it by the Ancient and Holy Fathers.

*Melanct. Loc.  
Com: Calv.  
Instit. Lib. 4.  
C. 73.*

*Luk. 22. 19.*

*Gen. 4. 15.*



## CHAP. XLV.

*Of the form of Consecrating the Elements, wherein it consisteth. Whether only Recitative or Supplicative.*

**A**ND to this duly communicating, is necessarily required the proper Form of this Sacrament: Which Form consisteth in two things principally, The Proper Actions of the Minister of it: and the Receiver of it. The Action of the Minister or Priest consisteth in the due consecration and Dedication of those Elements designed for that end: For as *Augustin* the father hath it, *The word coming to the Creature maketh it a Sacrament*, it gives being to it, as such; which before was but common bread and wine. And that this is done by the Recitation of the historie of Christs Celebration and Institution of them all at first; and Invocation of God upon the Elements, is certain: but it is not so certain, what special form of words is only and absolutely required to this purpose: nor, whether they are only Recitative, pronouncing the words of Christ at the Institution of this Sacrament, as, *This is my Body*; and so over the Cup, *This is my Blood*: or, whether they must be also Supplicative. The Greek Church and some of the Learnedest of the Roman hold the Latter to be necessarie, and the Former insufficient: The most common Opinion of the Western Church is, That the Consecration by way of decencie and solemnitie, ought to consist of Benedictions and Invocations of God; but that essentially is required nothing more than the recitation of Christs words over the Elements, for the real Consecration of them. And each side doth rather well prove their own practise, than answer the difficulties opposed to each other. For, as the Greeks well say, There is no great probability that an historical narration of what was done by Christ, should of it selfe be effectually to the Conversion of the Elements from their Common use and nature; to the divine. For it is only expected from him that rehearseth what another said or did, that he be a faithful reporter; and not that he should effectually thereby make a thing true. But on the other side, Prayer is not so much *Indicative*, as *Imperative* and *Impetrative*. We read indeed in *St Paul to Timothie*, of things that *are Sanctified by the word and Prayer*. But the word and Sanctification there, are no preaching or consecration, but only signify that God by the Gospel, which is his word proper, removed the sentence of uncleanness from things so judged to be, under the Law, and set them as free, as other reputed Clean: But prayer's proper Act and Office it is to bring down a special Benediction upon Sacramental and Familiar food. On the other side, the difference being so vast and Sacred between Common Creatures of bread and Wine, and the Sacramental, it was lookt upon as a thing of greatest use and concernment to all believers to know, whether such consecration was performed or not. But where the form was so loose and indetermin'd as it must needs be, consisting in the various and Prolix office, belonging thereunto, how could it possible be discerned when the Host was consecrated, and whether; seeing

*Christoph. de  
Cap. Fontium  
de Theolog.  
Scholast. Re-  
format.*

1 Tim. 4. 5.

seeing neither the whole Canon could be said thereunto absolutely necessary; nor could it be assigned what part thereof essentially and effectually performed be Consecration. Hereupon the Latine Church hath taken upon them to define the Conversion of the Elements into Christ, (for that they make Consecration) to a very few precise words used by Christ at the First Institution of his Holy Supper: viz: *This is my Body*, and *This is my Blood*. And I have not found how the Arguments on either side can be well answered; while the Opinion of trans-mentation, or such supposed conversion, stands Good; and is accepted: but otherwise it is no hard matter to answer Both. For (supposing not a change of the proper natures and substances of the Elements into the Body of Christ naturall, What inconvenience would it be, to be undetermined by a certain number of words, when the mystical change was wrought, granting that this change Relative is made by the word and Prayer, as the change of water in baptism is made not by any special number or form of words, but by the Office, whether longer or shorter? And therefore the necessity of putting the whole virtue in those few words recited, was received presently upon the doctrine of Transubstantiation, which is an argument that the Greek Church never admitted it, in the Latin sense; however, I know, they would not in their Councils, contend with them about that; but kept themselves to the tradition of their Predecessors, who restrained not the Consecration to such number of words; but must have with the like prudence, and necessity have done so, had they so apparently and expressly received such a simple conversion as being true, all Christians ought to be so punctually assured of, and venerate, that nothing in their Creed could be more necessary; and not contented themselves with the Relative change only of the things themselves: which precisely to know, stood them not so much in hand; seeing the Reverence given to the Visible objects could not exceed that communicable to Creatures. It may be granted therefore that the words of Christ are so necessary that Consecration cannot rightly be performed without them; but yet denied to be so operative, that upon the plain recitation of them, they should presently effect that great alteration of them: as the Story (I make no doubt) feigned to beget belief of this new opinion implieth, telling us, That certain Shepherds while it was the custom to pronounce the Canon of the Mass openly, having learned it, and recited it over their bread and wine which they had before them in the field as they were at their ordinary Meal, the bread was turned visibly into Christs body, and the Wine into his Blood; and that the Shepherds were struck dead from heaven: Whereupon it was decreed in a Synod that from thence forward, no man should rehearse the said Canon Audibly, or out of Sacred Places, or without Book, or without Holy Vestments, or without an Altar. A tale as likely to be true as the thing they would prove by it: And so let them pass together, while we proceed to the

*Henorius in  
Gemma Ani-  
ma. l. 1. 103.*

## CHAP. XLVI.

*Of the Participation of this Sacrament in both Kinds. The vanity of Papists allegations to the Contrary. No Sacramental Receiving of Christ in One kind only. How Antiquity is to be understood mentioning the receiving of one Element only. The pretended inconveniences of partaking in both kinds insufficient. Of Adoration of the Eucharist.*

**S**ECOND Thing formally necessary to this Sacrament; which is Celebration in both Kinds; or Bread and Wine. In treating whereof we must do so much Justice to the Cause, as to acknowledge a reasonable distinction between the Sacrament it self, and the Communicants in it. To the former, I suppose, it is agreed that indispensably both Elements are necessary, and Essential: and that there can be no Sacrament without them both, whatever solemnity may be acted to the eye, or ear. For the Sacrament not being a thing of natural force or vertue, but instituted, the very formality of the Institution consisting in the joint concurrence of both Elements, the Removing of One is the Adulteration of the Whole, and destruction: neither can that be said to be a Sacrament of Christs Institution; but, if at all, of mans devising. Neither do I see how the argument should not hold in the Participation of that Sacrament, as well as Consecration, *viz*: that, as consecration in one Kind only maketh not a Sacrament; so communication in one Kind, where both are in being, should be receiving the Sacrament. For the natures of things, as *Aristotle* hath it, are like numbers, which with the addition or Substraction of one, change their kind. We do not make Bread of the Nature of Wine; or on the contrary: but we make them both equally of the nature of that Sacrament, which by Christs own Institution was an Aggregate thing constituted of both: and therefore to withdraw, or deny one is in effect to deny both. And the Evasion to salve this is both ridiculous and prophane, which saith, *The blood is contained in the Body of Christ; and therefore in taking one, both are received.* But 'tis nothing so. For the Blood of Christ in the Sacrament is no more contained in the Body, than the Body in the blood. And besides, we say, that he who not at all receives the Cup, cannot at all receive the signified body of Christ, but only the signifying. Again, How can this assertion consist with the opinion of an *Incruent Sacrifice*? For either the Sacramental Body of Christ hath Blood in it, or it hath not. If it hath, then is it a Bloody, and not *Incruent Sacrifice*. (For I think there is no ground for a man to say a Sacrifice was called Bloody or Cruent, because only Blood was shed before it was Sacrificed, and not because, even at that time it contained



tained blood in it: For *Cruent* and *Incruent* are the same in the Law, from whence the Gospel borrows this Phrase, as *Animate* and *Inanimate* Sacrifices: ) If it hath not, how can it be said to have the blood of Christ also? Must not they be necessitated here to see to an unknown Concomitance the one of the other, and not a coexistence? And if thus: the blood hath the flesh of Christ concomitantly, as well as the flesh the blood: and so for this reason might the Cup be received without the Bread. But we positively deny both such Carnal, Capernaïtical Coexistence as is here presumed, and such necessary Concomitance too, that with the receiving of one alone, the other should be necessarily taken also: but hold rather, where both are not Present, both are absent; and no Sacramental Receiving of Christ can possibly be hoped for. And though I have been long of this opinion before I found any authority express to this purpose, besides the very intrinsique nature of the Sacrament it self, now touched; Yet am I not alone. For thus speaks a Reverent and Learned Father of our Church. *In all compounded things, the moiety of the matter is the moiety of substance: And what soever Jesuited Romanists teach, I see not how their Laicks can truly say, that they have at any time in all their Lives been partakers of this Sacrament: for if half a man be not a man, then likewise, half a Communion is not a Communion.*

Bishop Whites  
Reply to, &c.  
pag. 483.

But were there more colour, (for nothing of reality do we find in their Offers to vindicate themselves) in what is said for the possibility of a Sacrament in one Kind received: What can be said for their gross abuse of their and our Lords Institution, and their Relinquishing the unanimous practice of the Catholick Church for so many Ages together? Did not Christ equally institute both? Did he not equally communicate both to his Disciples? Or supposing that they were then all *Priests* (which may be well doubted of, seeing they were not compleatly consecrated, then by the descent of the Holy Ghost, nor commissioned to Go teach, and Baptise all nations until after this) doth this give any likelihood that therefore it is the sole Right for Priests to receive in both Kinds? Did Christ any where make two Institutions, One For Priests, and another for Laicks? If but one, Who should presume to alter or adulterate his Prescriptions? He said, *Drink ye all of this:* which is more than we find he said of the Bread. And the shift is sad, and pitiful which some who have nothing better to say, yet must say something; adde, that Christ said *This do as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of me:* As if he excepted sometimes from drinking, when he commanded to eat? Ridiculous! The meaning of Christ being as plain as any thing need be, that there should so often be had a devout remembrance of him, as we communicate, and not imply, as is most boldly insinuated, that sometimes we may not communicate in the Sacramental blood of Christ. For it followeth, *As Often as ye eat this bread and drink this cup ye do shew the Lords death till he come.* Never are they separated in the Scripture. No ground at all for the omitting of one rather than the other. The Church hath power to denie one as much as the other. The Church hath no power to denie either: or any thing else of such divine Institution. The Church of God for above 1200 years did constantly and universally practise both. And until the Council of *Constance* about the year 1415 many in the Roman Church so received: but then it was violently taken away. But to this very day all Churches not subdued to the Roman, continue the Ancient form. And do a companie of paltry reasons drawn from possible inconveniences in Lay-mens taking the Cup countervail so great a cloud of witnesses, and so strong

Mat. 26. 27.

1 Cor. 11. 25.  
Fisher again<sup>d</sup>  
White.

1 Cor. 11. 26.

strong arguments to the contrary? What if sometimes the Ancients did permit the exportation of the one without the other to such as were sick or unable to receive in Publique? Does this come home to the Case which requireth that the Publique Ministration should be changed a so? And how doth it appear (I am sure not by their demonstrations) that such Persons so receiving in ha'f, were ever reputed to have *Sacramentally* received Christ? Nay, not half of the Authorities, or Instances commonly given of such Communications do concern this subject: for most are to be understood of the *Panis Benedictus*, or the Bread blessed by the Priest, upon the offering of it by the People: which was not all consecrated *Sacramentally* and so given unto Christians to be imparted to such as were of the same Communion, in token that they were in Communion with them, though absent. This, I grant, was sometimes performed by the sending to such, the Consecrated Element of Bread in the Eucharist: Not with an opinion of the Fathers of the Church, however possibly some vulgar and ignorant Christians might have too high a conceit of it; that such receiving was *tantum* to the receiving in both Kinds *Sacramentally*. But to their inconveniences, which are many of them more fit to make sport, than to sway in so grave a Controversie, we shall only reply that all they can alleadg was no newes to their, and our Predecessours; and yet never could it enter into their hearts to attempt so monstrous a change upon such frivolous pretences. But the truth is, the Errour of transubstantiation being thoroughly received, occasioned this, by way of common prudence, as well as Christian devotion. For it being firmly and clearly believed, the Consecrated Elements became Christs Bodie and Blood, forsaking wholly their own Nature; Common Reason required that all possible respect and Care should be taken, as far as the wit of man could reach, that no detriment or indignity should be done to them: and that then became indecent and prophane which before was not. To have the Least Crum fall aside, must be accounted a grand prophanation, though in voluntary and therefore humane wit invented *Wafers* and preferred them before bread, according as Christ used it. In breaking of the Host some possible waste might happen therefore though Christ, and following Christians communicated of one Bread, according to St Paul, *For we are one Bread and one bodie: and we are all partakers of one Bread*; undoubtedly literally meaning the participation by many, of the same Loaf in the Sacrament; now superstition hath better instructed us than the holy Spirit St Paul: and there must be no more breaking of bread amongst Christians, of which the Scripture speaks so often (though I confess not alwayes meaning the Eucharist but yet that too, many times) and which is so lively and proper a Ceremony and signification of Christs passion lest somewhat should fall out amiss toward the supposed Body of Christ in their sense. To give Respect, to use reverence to it; to take all convenient and devout Care about it, is verie reasonable and pious, for the Relation it hath to Christ and his Proper Bodie, and the Virrue to us, but nothing could suffice to lay aside the proper ceremonies used at the Institution, or form of it, but such an opinion as that of Transubstantiation: It now sufficing, according to modern Judgments, that the several Wafers now in use, were all one when they came first from mill, and are broken by the Teeth in actually receiving them: whereas Christ represented the unity of his mystical Members, and Fraction of his Natural Body by the Forms set before his Disciples, the better to affect our hearts and quicken our devotion. To the same end in Ancienter, though not first

dayes

1 Cor. 10. 17.

Bellarmin.

dayes of Christianity, there was an Elevation of the Myſteries made by the Prieſt, to ſhew only how Chriſt was Lifted up on the Croſs, for our ſins: but upon the doctrine and perſwaſion of tranſubſtantiation, this was corrupted and perverted to the drawing people to a direct Adoration terminated in the Viſible objects; and not, as was anciently uſed from that Action, to take an occaſion of worſhipping Chriſt himſelf, with a ſequeſtration of their mind from their ſenſes. To this likewise pertains the Groſſer devotion for many hundred years impractiſed, and unknown to Chriſtians, that not only Adoration to God and Chriſt ſhould be made by all who approached, as Communicants, to theſe Holy Myſteries; but that the Hoſt ſhould be on purpoſe publickly expoſed to the view of all enterers into the Church, where it is, with an injunctiſion to exhibit all devout and divine worſhip to it: which invention the Fathers and all Chriſtian Churches were holy ignorant of, for many hundred years; and never was there ſo much as a Feaſt of *Corpus Chriſti* till *Urbane* the *Fourth* inſtituted one, about the year 1263. And the Adoration of the Hoſt, as Chriſt himſelf, much later. But if ſuch an opinion had been of any tolerable Antiquity in the Church, how could it be avoided but ſuch direct and open Adoration ſhould have been given, much more early: it being a moſt ancient Principle of Chriſtian Faith, that Chriſt was God: and of common humane reaſon, that God is to be worſhipped. And yet no mention made of ſuch Adorations as are of late introduced and required: which is an argument they never believed, as now the Romaniſts do: for had they, they muſt have neceſſarily done as they do. But a ſtop muſt be put to this luxuriant Subject, to keep our ſelves in the Limits preſcribed to our ſelves; and here let it be. Only having hitherto ſpoken of the Preparatories to Chriſtian Faith, the nature, Kinds, Acts, effects, and Laſtly ſubject, which is the Church; and of this again in its Political, and Myſtical Capacity and Power, which conſiſts in the due Adminiſtration of the Sacraments, as well Properly as Improperly and Equivocally ſo called; It remains now to conclude and Crown the preſent doctrine of the Church, with that which is moſt contrary of all things, to the Nature of a Viſible Church; and that is Schiſm: For by this unnatural ſtate, the true Nature of the Church is more illuſtrated; and the Unitie of it by the explication of this Separation and Diſ-union, called Schiſm.



## CHAP. XLVII.

*The Conclusion of the Treatise of the subject of Christian Faith, the Church; by the treating of Schism contrary to the Visible Church. Departure from the Faith real Schism; not formal as to the outward form. Of the state of Separation or Schism. Of separation of Persons Coordinate and Subordinate. Of Formal and Vertual Schism. All Heresie vertually Schism, not formally. Separation from an Heretical Society, no Schism: From Societies not Heretical, Schism. Heretical Doctrine or Discipline justifie Separation. How separation from a true Church is Schism, and how not. In what sense we call the Roman Church a true Church. Some instances of Heretical Errors in the Roman Church. Of the Guilt of Schism. Of the notorious guilt of English Sectaries. The folly of their Vindications. That the Case of them and us is altogether different from that of us and the Church of Rome. Not lawful to separate from the Universal Church.*

**W**Hile we treat of the Church, it must be alwaies remembred that we intend not to speak of the Invisible Church, as it is taken for a select number supposed to belong intimately and inseparably to Christs invisible Body, of which no knowledge, or account can be had, but by sensible outward things: but we altogether enquire of the Visible Church which though it be not alwaies Actually seen, or discerned from other Societies (especially pretending to be Churches of Christ) yet must alwaies be Visible; though not conspicuous. And it would be a gross mistake in any, so to judge of the Church Visible and Invisible as of distinct Churches, or necessarily distinct parts of the same Church: because the same persons may at the same time be of the Visible, and Invisible Church. This distinction then is to be allowed no farther than as it insinuates to us the Several States of the Members of the same

same Church: the Church in nature being but One; according to several testimonies of Holy-Writt; and the very nature of all Communities, and much more of the Church, which is to be an Aggregate Body consisting of many parts, by no natural Bond or influence united together, but by divine and spiritual. Which is manifested by certain outward Acts, which renders and denominates such a society of Men, Visible, as a Church of Christ. These Acts are principally two The profession and declaration in word or writing of the true Faith, and the *Exercise* of those Graces and works which that Faith requires in Religious worship and Obedience. That, and in what degree of necessity this Church must be One as well as Visible, is before declared; and here only repeated to give light to the nature of Schisme, now to be explained: For to omit the Criticisms, and various acceptations of the word *Schism*, as not necessary; we shall proceed by degrees to shew these two things concerning it, The Nature, and Guilt of it.

*False Professionis Imagine utimur si cuius nomine gloriamur ejus instituta non sequimur.* Leo, Mag. Sermon. 5. de Febr. 7. Mensis.

For the Nature of Schism; it doth appear from the Unitie and conjunction of Christs Body, of the Church, consisting in two things; Communion with Christ the Head, and mutual Communion of the members one with another: the contrary to this must needs be Discommunion and Separation. But there being two parts in Communion, a *Material*, or the things in which men communicate, as faith it selfe, and the substantial Part of Christian worship: And a *Formal*, the Actual outward exercise of this: The First of these, though it be really, yet is not formally Schism, as may appear more fully by and by: because all Schism doth suppose some agreement with, and Relation to that One Body, the Church: but where the foundation of such Relation is destroyed, there the whole perishes. And therefore a division from the Faith of Christs bodie, the Church, being either Total, and that again either *Negatively*, when a man never was inserted into that Stock, is more properly called Atheism, or Heathenism, or *Privative*, and then is called Apostasie, which is a professed renunciation of the Faith once received. Or this Division is Partial, and so it takes the name of Heresie upon it. Schism then must needs be an outward Separation from the Communion of the Church. But when we say Schism is a Separation, we do not mean so strictly, as if it consisted in the Act of Separating, so much as the State: For we do not call any man a Schismaticke, who sometimes refuses to communicate with the Church in its outward worship, though that done wilfully is a direct way to it, (as all frequented Actions do at length terminate in habits of the same Nature) but it is rather a *State* of separation; and of Dissolution of the continuitie of Church; in a moral or divine sense, not natural, which we seek into at present.

This Separate State then being a Relation of Opposition, as the other was of Conjunction; the Term denominating and signallizing both, is to be enquired unto: And that is insinuated already, and must needs be, the Church; and that as that is united unto Christ; or the true Church. For there is no separation from that which really is not, though it may seem to be. It must therefore be a true Church from whence Schismatical separation is made. So far do they confute and confound themselves who excuse their Schismaticalness from that which principally constitutes Schism, and Schismaticks, *viz.* an acknowledgement of that to be a true Church from which they divide themselves, and separate.

Again, We are to note that Separation is either of Persons and Churches in Co-ordination, or subordination: according to that excellent and an-

Optatus Mile-  
siton. Cont.  
Parmen. Lib.  
3. Aldit.

Eugrius Hist.  
Eccl. L. C. 30.

cient distinction of Optatus, saying, *It is one thing for a Bishop to communicate with a Bishop: and another for a Lay man (or the Inferiour Clergy) to communicate with the Bishop.* And this, because what may perhaps justify a Non-communication with Co-ordinate Persons or Churches, which have no authority one over another, will not excuse Subordinate Persons or Churches, owing obedience to their Superiours, from Schism. From whence it is manifest, that though all Schism be a Separation yet all Separation is not a Schism. And though there may be many and just causes for a Separation, there can be no cause to justify a Schism: For Schism is in its nature, *A studious Separation (or State Separate) against Christian Charity, upon no sufficient Cause or grounds.* It must be affected or Studious, because if upon necessity, or involuntary, the Disjunction of Churches is rather a punishment than a sin: and an Infelicity rather than Iniquity: as in the dayes of Anastatius the Emperour, as Evagrius relates it, *Who so violently persecuted the Catholick Church, in behalfe of the Euty-chian Heresie, that it was crumbled, as it were, into several parcels; And the Governours could not communicate one with another, but the Eastern, and Western, and African Churches were broke asunder.* Which farther shews that a Criminal Separation, which we make synonymous with Schism, must likewise be an Act proceeding from the persons to separated, and not the Act of another. For no man can make another a Schismatick, any more than he can make him a Lyar or a drunkard, without his consent. For if the Governours of one Church expeel out of Communion another, upon no just grounds; the Church thus separated is not the Schismatick, but the other: as appears from the words of Firmilianus Bishop of Cappadocia, in St Cyprian concerning Pope Stephen, advising him he should not be too huse or presumptuous in separating others, lest he thereby separated himself: so that if the Schism had broke out, upon no good grounds, he, who was the Architect of it, Separated himself; as all others do: and it is impossible any man should make (though he may declare) another a Schismatick, any more than he can make him erre without his consent, or be uncharitable. Yet do they err also, that from hence conclude that the Formal reason of Schism consists in Separating a mans self; for it is rather the material Cause than formal. The formal Cause being (as in all other things) the very Constitution it self, with unreasonableness and uncharitableness. No man can make another involuntarily an Heretick. And therefore no man can make another a Schismatick. All the Guilt redounding to the Agent, not Patient in such cases. So that it is scarce worth the Enquiring, Who began the breach of unity, as it outwardly appears, but who is actually and Really First divided from Christs Church: For they surely are the proper Schismatics, though the name may stick closer to others.

Azovius Inst.  
Moral. Tom. 1.  
Lib. 3. C. 20.

To understand this, we may consider that there is a *Virtual Schism* and a *Formal Schism*. A Virtual Schism I call real division from Christs Church; though it comes not to an open opposition to it, or Defiance of it: so that where ever is any heresie or considerable Error nourished, or maintained in a Church, there is to be found a Schismatick also in reality, though not in formality: the reason hereof is well expressed by, and may best come from, the hand of an Adversary to us, thus judiciously enquiring, *It is demanded first (saith he) Whether Schismatics be Hereticks?* Answer, *The Common opinion of the Interpreters of the Canon Law, and of the Summists is that the Heretick differs from the Schismatick, in that, Every Heretick is a Schismatick, but not on the contrary: Which they prove because the term Schismatick, signifies Division. But every Heretick turns away, separates, divides himself from the Church.* This



is very plain and reasonable : and so is the consequence from hence : That where the Body is so corrupt, as to be really infected with notorious errors, there it is really ( so far as it is erroneous ) separated from the true Church ; and where it is so far separated from the true Church, so far it is Schismatical. And when a Church is thus far really Schismatical, little or no Scruple is to be made of an outward Separation : neither can a guilt be affixed unto it. And on the other side, if no such real separation, and antecedent Guilt can be found in a Church, in vain do diverse betake themselves to that specious Shift and evasion, *that they were cast out, and went not out willingly from a Church : and that they are willing to return, but are not suffered.* For undoubtedly the very supposition is insincere and faulty ; that they forsook not the Church, before they were ejected ; And the expulsion followed separation and dissent from it ; and was not rather the Effect than Cause of them ; as are all excommunications rightly used. For to those that pretend they were turned out, do not the doors stand open to receive them, and that with thanks, if they please to re-enter, and re-unite, themselves. What do they here alledge in there excuse and Defence ? They are readie to return, but they cannot be admitted but upon unreasonable Terms and conditions. How does this appear if it should be denied, as without all peradventure it will ? Must not the Defendents be here forced to take their grounds of Apologie and Justification from the very things themselves, under debate, and put in their exceptions against the terms upon which they are to be receiv'd, or condemn themselves ? Neither will it suffice to say, We shall be hardly used, or beaten, if we return to such severe Masters, and therefore we will keep out. For they may deserve it : and though nature teacheth a man, as it did *Hagar*, to flee from her Mistress *Sarrah's* Tent, for fear of blows, yet God and Justice, and Christian Charity advise us to return to our Duty. It must then be necessarily alledged and made good, That we deserve not to be so ill used ; or rather that it is ill usage which we fore-see : shall befall us and that, the case so standing, it is not our duty to return : and all this can no waies possible be made good, but by examination of the matter it self. And that which will Justifie us from not returning will also warrant our free Separation at first. 'Tis the cause then that makes the Separation, Schism, or not. An Instance whereof we have in the famous Schism of the Donatists : which almost all Christians now adays confesse to have been notorious Schismatics, because they could not make good their Reasons which induced them : for could they, they had not been Schismatics ; as a sober Author notes upon *Optatus* thus ; *If those things were true which the Donatists laid to Cecilianus, and Mensurius and Cecilianus had polluted themselves with Idolatry, The Donatists had offended nothing against the Discipline and Canons of the Church, refusing to communicate with Cecilianus and his Companions.* That is, they had not been Schismatics, if so be they could have made good their Principal Charges against the Church.

*Albaspinus Ob-  
servat. In Op-  
tat. pag. 3.*

And this we may bring home to our selves, as now we stand divided from other Churches, and particularly that of Rome. For if the Corruptions in doctrine and Practice be not sufficient to justifie our present posture of opposition : if they had not before we left them, departed from the true faith ; if they were not really and materially Schismatiques before we were divided from them ; then surely we were, at our separation, and so continue. For to say, We have a willing mind to unity, we have Charity so great that we earnestly desire Reconciliation with them, is to deceive the world,  
and

and our selves and encourage and justify Schism in others, who no doubt will all pretend to so much charity as to declare themselves willing to embrace unity upon their own terms. But in such cases we cannot be said to go to them, though in outward appearance we may seem so to do, as they come to us. The question therefore is to be put under the circumstances as now they are, and as the Case is now with them. And in that it ought, and may be roundly and resolutely answer'd, We neither can, nor ought, nor will re-unite; and yet well enough free our selves from Schism, upon the account of the Justness of the occasions and Causes there found, and given us, to divide from them.

Then ought it to be enquired (for this they passionately call for) what are those errors which that Church is subject to, for which a Separation may be Legitimated, and not participate of the nature of Schism. It is commonly and with general consent averred, (and that even by leaving Schismatics amongst us,) That Corruption in Art or manners is not sufficient to warrant a Separation from a Church subject to them, and so infected; no not perhaps though Idolatry it self should be too common amongst them, in it; when no necessity lies upon the particular Members, to be obnoxious to the same; the doctrine of Christ bearing up its head above it, and obeyed truly by others. But when Evil actions, and notorious errors in Fact shall come to that height as to be reduced to doctrine, and formed into an heretical or Idolatrous proposition, as in time it must of necessity be, (it being natural, as well to all Churches, as persons to defend by argument what they choose to practise,) and be taught publicly, then doth that Church become truly Heretical and Idolatrous, and from that Church which hath so far departed from the Faith, any Church or person may lawfully depart without Scruple of Schism, though such separation be not absolutely necessarie: because, though the infection be common, it is not necessarily so general, that all should be obliged to espouse it, and be corrupted by it; but when to this degree of doctrine, shall be added a third, which is of Precept, and such unsound and pernicious opinions shall be imposed on others, and exacted of all, there it is not only lawful but necessary to salvation, to divide from such a pretended Church of Christ: I mean a necessity of *Precept*, though not of *Means*: as if it were not possible that a man should be saved who liveth in an Heretical or Idolatrous Church, though with those many circumstances of a general Right Intention, humble walking with God, and invincible ignorance of the more pure and Christian Faith and worship.

For there is undoubtedly a Mean between these two, Necessity to Salvation, and Necessity of Damnation. Well might *Athanasius* say, *Whosoever will be saved it is necessary that he hold the Catholick Faith*: and add yet farther; *Which Faith except a man do keep whole and undefiled, without doubt he shall perish everlastingly*; and so give us the particulars of that Faith, so necessary. For he means no more than, that such Errors are in themselves damnable: But heresies do not work after the manner of such natural Causes, which have such effects infallibly, but may be said notwithstanding naturally to tend to such events, which yet may be prevented by various Allayes of Circumstances both inward and outward, impeding such Effects. The Consideration of which possibility of escaping the ordinary danger, can no ways excuse a man or confirm him in such errors, but the common; and, as you may say, natural tendency, of them to ruine and perdition, strongly oblige him to relinquish that Church wherein it is only possible, by virtue of

of some extraordinarie indulgence of God, to come to salvation; and whose errors are of themselves damnable. So if the Question be put (as generally it is) Whether (for example) a man may not be saved in the Roman Church? The answer is abundantly sufficient within Religion and Divinitie; though perhaps not so formal in Logick, That *they certainly may be damn'd*, and that for holding the Faith and worship there commanded, and received with full approbation. And this is sufficient to call any sober Christian off from that communion; though there may occur so many mitigating Circumstances, as to a Person of that communion, which may detain any man of Christian modesty and Charity from pronouncing such an one to be infallibly damn'd, or out of possibility to salvation.

And if it be hereupon demanded; What difference we put between Infidels, and such corrupt Christians, seeing diverse have undertaken to assert a Possibility of salvation to them also, living exactly to the Light and Rule of Nature in them; I answer, not absolutely at present dashing the argument a-pieces by denying the supposition, and their colourable proofs thereof, but demonstrating a vast discrimination between the one, and other condition. For commonly, where Heresies which are so properly called, and not Gentilism (as they are which destroy the first Principles of Christianity) are taught, and maintained, there are to be found all truths necessary to salvation, in a Christian sense. For the Holy Scriptures (we suppose) are there received, and submitted unto (*which are able to make a man wise unto salvation, and thoroughly to furnish him unto all good works*). And the Records of the Church, and ancienter practise; good guides against the rocks way-laying a man in his course to Heaven. And the want of actual communion with a Church doth then only expose our souls to Perdition, when it is wilfully and causelessly slighted and contemned: And then only doth Separation visible, or less Visible alienation of mind and affection put on the nature of Schism.

2 Tim: 3. 16,  
17.

And there are two general defects in a Church which justify Separation; according to those two things we have shewed do constitute a Church: Doctrine of Faith, and Divine Regiment, called commonly, *Discipline*. If a Church errs notoriously in the former, no Separation can be called Schism; or if defective not in Government absolutely (for without some Government it could not be so much as a Society) but in the Government ordained for it, because then it should not be a Christian Society. For the faith of Christians held, do not make a Christian Society, but the Christian Regiment: Christian Regiment also I call that, not where-by Christians are Governed (for Civil Governments are common to Heathens and Christians) but that which is Proper to Christians as Christians, and was instituted by Christ, for Christians; and not invented out of mens wise brains, and accommodated to the Church, and perhaps called Divine, to give it greater credit, and place amongst Christians. Of which we have already spoken. It being a common rule amongst the Ancients, immutable with me, *There can be no true Flock without true Pastours*. And there can be no true Pastours where they are not set over the Flock according to Christs known and received will, but some presumed, tacit and extraordinary Vocation (as they term it) when there is an entrance by the Window, and not by the Door.

Clement Alex:  
and, Stromat.

From hence it doth appear, how uncertain and confused their notion and position is, who without any more adoe, conclude all those to be Schismatics (and that upon their own Principles and Concessions) who separate

rate



rate from a Christian Societie which they acknowledge to be a true Church. For very great is the ambiguity both of *Separation* and *True Church*. First, Separation is (as we have before noted) either of Subordinates; or Co-ordinates. And of Subordinates, either simply, or with Restriction. Simply subordinate I call them not comparatively with Christs Imperial Power, but with all External power, who by divine Right of Providence, owe direct obedience to their Pastours, in all things, not inhibited by the Law of God, to which all Spiritual Pastours are to be no less subject than the sheep themselves. And thus every Bishop is true Head and Governor of that Flock which, under Christ, is committed to his Care and Custodie: But in like manner is not that Bishop subject to the Metropolitane, and much less, that Metropolitane to his Patriarch. For these are but Ecclesiastical Constitutions, and of no distinct Order, though Degree. According to which obligations of obeying, the refusing to obey, and dis-uniting ones self from the Governours of the Church, doth aggravate or extenuate the Division; and the guilt thereof. And without all peradventure may one Church divide from another, upon less grounds then the Members of one Church separate from the more immediate Head of the same. How thick do instances stand in Ecclesiastical History of Churches, who by vertue of their Respective Governours, have been divided, and yet both remain true Churches. Again, a True Church is said so to be more than one way: *viz.* As to Being *absolutely*; and Being *perfectly*. We know that every Errour in Doctrine, though great, nay though heretical, doth not presently destroy the nature of a Church absolutely, though it takes away from the perfection of a Church. How that opinion was delivered by the Fathers, *viz.* That *Heresie destroys the Church*, we have shewed in part, speaking of Heresie: and now may add farther; that the same persons of old, or their Co-equals, denied an Heretique to be a Christian also: and therefore they are to be understood of the such foul and unchristian Heresies which rased the foundation of faith it self: as did the Valentinians, the Gnosticks, the Marcionites and such like: For tis now agreed to, That unless a man be a Christian, he cannot be an Heretique; Or if at any time they spake of more tolerable Heresies, not wholly inconsistent with Christianity it self; then they laid the burden of Damnation upon that accessorie, but separable Aggravation, *Uncharitableness*: which alone, and especially conjoined with such errors, exposed to damnation. But as it is with the Natural Man, it is with the Spiritual: There are some parts Essential, and Vital, which cannot be wanting or corrupted, but the Whole must loose its nature and denomination: and there are others not absolutely Essential, which are called Integral, without which the Body may possible subsist, but not be perfect in its material Parts. And so it is with the Body of Faith consisting of so many Articles, or members, as Parts; some Vital and essential; some necessarie to its perfections; but not its Being absolutely. And a Church may be called a true Church which is defective or Excessive in these, though not in them. And yet we need not betake our selves to that explication by some used, of a True-man and a Thief, to express how a Church may be a True Church and an erroneous one, at the same time. For the nature of this truth we ascribe unto the Church consisting only in Morality; If the Church failes in that, the Nature of it failes, as it doth not in a man when he is corrupted with falseness and vice: But this we say, That although all Truths are equally true, as to the nature of Truth it self, they are not of equal importance and use to us, or to a Church.

There

Cyprianus Epi-  
stola 52. ubi  
Novatianus esse  
Christianos

Therefore such a Latitude being in the notion, of a True Church, how can any man so confidently say that, *No Church can separate from the Church of Rome but they must make themselves thereby Schismatiques before God, though before the Church they cannot be condemned for such*, qualifying this hard saying with this Supposition only, *That the Church of Rome alwayes had and hath Salvation in it, as a true Church, though corrupted.* For that we may, and do call a True Church, wherein the principles of Christianity are kept intire, as to the most fundamental of them: but withal, this hinders not, but diverse things at the same time, and by the same Church which are damnable, may be found in it. For in the same house saith *St Paul, there are Vessels to honour and dishonour*: which we may as well interpret of Tenets of faith, as of the Professours of the Faith. And in the same Dispensatorie, are both Poisons and Cordials: yea, in the same dish may be found Food sufficient to nourish and destroy; shall we therefore not be careful to avoid the whole, because we do acknowledge the wholesomness of so many in it. Who knowes not that there are monstrousnesses in Excess as well as defect? And that it suffices not to keep a man in communion with a Church; that all things necessary are therein contained; when withal many things not only unnecessary, but pernicious are shuffled together with them. If we can therefore shew, (as we suppose we have and can) that the Roman Church alloweth and propoundeth many heretical dogmes, many Idololatrical practises; what will it avail them to have it granted them that all truths are extant there in the Monuments of their Church? It will here infallibly be replied by them, That it cannot be that a Church at the same time can hold all things needful in Faith, and worship, and yet maintain such errors as are charged upon them. To which I say, and grant, That 'tis not possible they should hold the same things as contrary, or appearing so unto them: But really they may, and actually doe. First, as Philosophers shoud of contraries *In gradu remisso*, not *Intenso*, In the remisser and lower degrees, not the extremest. Secondly, They may hold contraries really, though not formally, and as contrary. For instance, They may hold this fundamental opinion, *That God alone is to be worshipped with that divine worship which is the supreme of all*: And they may hold that such a thing (for example) the *Hof* is very God, which verily is not God; and consequently may teach the worship of such a reputed God. Their Churches faith if it teaches strictly that only the true God is to be worshipped, is inviolate, and sound in *Thesis*: But their Perswasion that such this is, is an error in fact, rather than in Faith; which contradicts the former opinion really. But we hold, That it is necessary to salvation that we erre not in such gross facts, though we abominate, detest, and renounce the sin never so solemnly. And the like may we say in many points of difference between us and them: when they hold the proposition in General, sound, and good; but by help of infinite and unintelligible distinctions, word it out, and ware off the imputation, but not the Guilt of Error. Of the number of which things hard to be understood, is that consideration of *Schism before God*, and *Schism before the Church*, with an implication that Separation from a true Church makes men Schismaticks before God, though not before men: because (for example,) The Church of Rome cannot oblige any body to stand to the Authority, which it so abaseth; namely, by breaking the Canons of the Church. It is true, A Church or Man may be a Schismatick before God, and not before the Church. But it cannot possibly be imagined how a man can be a Schismatique before men and from men, and not before God. But if it could be,

2 Thef. 3. 6.

were we not in a very fair way to hell, if we had no more to answer for than our Schism before God? Were not our whole Church Schismatical, and as good as lost, though men took no notice of it. It doth not follow therefore, neither is it confessed, that all are Schismatics who separate from a true Church, unless the separation be from it, *As it is true*. For we have shown, that a Church true in essentials, may fail in Integrals: And it is no hard matter to show that a Church Erring in doctrines constituting the body of Faith, may be separated from, without Schism. And the reason proving this is, because that such Churches are already really Schismatical, through the said errors: and it is not only lawful, but a duty to separate from Schismatics. For so saith St. Paul, *We command you brethren in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, that ye withdraw your selves from every brother that walketh disorderly, and not after the tradition which he received of us*. And what Traditions, do we think St. Paul intendeth there. Only Ecclesiastical Canons, and decrees of Councils for the better Government of the Catholick Church. That this he may mean I denie not; but that no more, I denie. For he that offends against the Faith, offends against the Traditions *To the Church*; but he that breaks the Constitutions, offends against the Traditions *Of the Church* only, which are of far inferiour nature. It may well be doubted, whether breaking of the Canons of the Church only can justify a Separation from a Church: because they are not so much the Traditions delivered *To the Church* by Christ and his Apostles, as the Traditions *Of the Church*, which in their nature are mutable. But yet if any co-ordinate Church shall refuse to innovate, but stick resolutely and firmly to the received Discipline and Lawes of the Church, while others shall violate them and choose new Forms, and impose new Conditions of communion with it, not agreeable to the old, upon which a schism followes; surely the guilt of Schism is to fall only upon that Church which thus innovates. For though I am apt to believe that such alterations may not be sufficient to justify a renunciation of Communion with such an Innovating Church, (and much less in single persons and private members of the same Church) yet doubtless it fully excuses from the guilt of Schism, if it patiently and passively persists in the more ancient and conformable way to the Churches of Christ in past ages, even with apparent peril of Schism: provided that the said Traditional Laws and practices shall not by the more judicious and conspicuous part of the Church assembled freely, and Lawfully in Council be judged inconvenient, and so according to the Right it hath to reverse or establish things in nature alterable declar'd void; and introduce new. For in such cases, disowning of the Power and Authority of the Church, and refusing the decrees thereof tending to the General unitie of it, is of it self a Schismatical Act. But in notorious errors in Doctrine or Faith, it is free for any particular Church to divide from another: because such corruption is of it self damnable: And in such cases we need not say to extenuate, I know not what unkindness, or perhaps incivility, *we were driven out from such communion, and went not out of our selves*; but may declare Franckly, *We voluntarily chose to relinquish such communion, so condition'd*. Now such errors we may well charge the Church of *Rome* with, even while we hold it to be a true Church, in the sense above expressed, *viz. Essentially true*; but not *Integrally*. For so a Monstrous man may beget a truly natural son; and out of the Loyns of the Corrupt Church of *Rome* may proceed a Perfect Church. And he that holds that a man may, even now when it is much more definitive and expresse in its errors than it was about seven-

score



score years ago, when it met first with that Opposition which it could never master as yet, be saved in the Church of *Rome*, may hold there are many damnable errors in it, which in their nature do damn, yet do not alwayes actually damn, as is said. And this doth altogether vindicate such Churches as directly leave them, provided they leave such their errors only; and not extravagantly hurry themselves into contrary errors, out of detestation to theirs. And this doth lay a necessity upon such as communicate with them to desert them, and a much greater upon such as are at present, alienated from them, to preserve themselves from such imminent dangers, though not infallibly destroying the soul.

Now if it be here demanded, as I know necessarily it must and will be, that, to make this high charge probable, we give some instances of such their errors and Schismaticalness, though I might well decline that so great and copious a subject, in this transient and compendious discourse, referring them to what hath been sufficiently written (though some have, I confess, weakly and inconsiderately over-acted) to this purpose, yet I shall not absolutely, without this general touch, leave the matter so: reducing their Errors to these two Heads, Schismatical Doctrines, and Heretical. And this alone I look on as a most Schismatical dogm, next to heresie, and which alone suffices to justify the separation of all other Churches from that of *Rome*, viz. That they maintain, if not in express termes, which some do (who perhaps will not be acknowledged when they are pinched hard to speak the sense of the Church) in reality, That the Pope or See of *Rome* hath arbitrary power, of himself, to Judge and Censure all Churches, and to institute, or Cassate Lawes for the universal Church: and that he cannot be a Schismatick. There is nothing more fundamental in the Lawes and Traditions of the Catholick Church, than that no one of the Patriarchs should presume to form, or oblige the Catholick Church by their single and private Canons and Decrees, without the consent and concurrence of his Brethren; neither can any meeting deserve the name of a General Council wherein their sentence is not heard or received: But there is nothing more notorious than the Bishop of *Rome*'s invasion of a sole Right to Govern the whole Church: of which he hath been often soundly charged by the eminentest of the Later of the Greek Bishops, though their complaint hath generally been received no otherwise than with a deaf ear, or an insolent stomach; and contempt of the Sacred Canons of the Church, as might be made appear by several instances; were this a proper opportunity so to do; Neither do I know how they of *Rome* can exempt themselves from appatent Schisme, upon the account which *Balsam* urgeth against them, viz. That the Popes have separated and are divided from the Four other Patriarchs. Will they say, they are Schismaticks and Hereticks? It is no more then they will pay them with again. And 'tis no harder matter to prove one than the other. But if Four of the Patriarchs of the Church may be Hereticks and Schismaticks and so continue for many hundreded years together, What becomes of that argument for the true Church taken from the Universality of its Profession. For putting the Case, that those of the Roman Communion were equal, yea Superior in extent of Ground and number of professers (which is hardly to be granted) yet being apparently inferiour in the number of Patriarchs, they cannot pretend universality; unless they beg the question, as too often and importunately they do, that the Roman See is the only Standard to weigh and Conclude all Ecclesiastical controversies and quarrels. This is, as we

*Est solus in Orleuni Characteris Episcopatus: suique ordinis principium & finis. Anastasius Germanus De Indultis Apostolicis Prefat. S. Episcopus, & Vide etiam Verbum Gregorium Synonym. L. 15. C. 3. quid tribuitur Popæ supra Conciliis & Principibus.*

*Nilus Thessalonicensis.*

*Balsam. Resp. 1. Juris Græco. Rom. L. 5. pag. 370.*

Vid. Aug. Bar-  
bossam de Offi-  
cio & Potesta-  
te Episc. Par. 3.  
Allegat. 57.  
num. 3, 4, 5, 6,  
7.

said, such a fundamental Errour in the outward Politie and Discipline of the Church, that it alone might justifie a Separation from such a Monster.

I shall give but one instance, and that of one Man expressing the sense of the Church of Rome, though some will have it called The Court of Rome only, concerning the Popes Power. *He [the Pope] is the Universal Bishop of the Church. He hath the whole World for his Diocess. He is the Bishop of Bishops. The Ordinarie of Ordinaries. In things concerning Benefices he hath free and absolute power. All Benefices in respect of this Holy Prelate are manual, and he may use absolute power in them.*

But to this adding such, to us, manifest errors and corruptions in Faith and practise as have been introduced into that Church, there can be no just Scruple made of Separating, and to profess so much, without mincing the matter by certain fine evasions which strictly enquired into will no more satisfie than down-right dealing; which chargeth them with such heretical-Dogmes, which contrary to Charity as well as Verity require Separation. Of the many of which that of Transubstantiation may claim the first place together with its long Train of Gross abuses, and Errours following upon, and flowing from it. For though I know diverse Learned men of our Church do look upon it as a very absurd falsity in matter of Fact, rather then of Faith: yet if it be considered as reduced to Propositions invented and strenuously asserted to maintain that Errour in fact, it putteth on the nature of Heresie too. To say that Christ had but one hand, is not an Heresie of it self: but a notorious non-truth in matter of Fact: But so to defend this opinion as thereby to deny Christ to have been of the same nature with us, amounts to Heresie. Granting likewise, that not only Christs Natural Body is in that Sacrament, but it is that very thing which after Consecration appears (though not as it appears) to our senses is but a fowl absurdity, and error in point of Fact. Yet when it is so defended, as to call in question the truth of Christs divine nature, and to commend and command the direct worship of those objects so mistaken; then certainly it is Heresie, and somewhat more. And so their doctrine of Communicating in one Kind, contrary to all the mention we have of celebrating the Eucharist in the Scriptures, and those deserving the name of Fathers in the Church: may rightly be termed Heretical, when it shall be drawn into such a Proposition as this (as of necessity it must,) viz. *That it is of equal vertue and use to receive the Sacrament in one kind alone, as both Kinds*: whereas only to deny the use of it, is no more than an unjust and sacrilegious piece of Tyranny over the Laicks. To these it were easie to add more of like natures as sufficient Grounds to leave such a Church as maintains them.

But for those who are not in Episcopal, nor yet so much as Metropolitan subordination and subjection to that Church, but only Patriarchal (which obliges chiefly, if not only, to a recognition of a Remote Right of Order, and Principle of unity; when the Church is united, in bringing them to Councils and keeping them to those Laws which are prescribed by General Consent of the Church) and this not originally, by first planting and forming a Christian Church in a Nation, but restoring and augmenting it, the case is yet more plain, that it is free for such Churches to relinquish communion of any Church subject to less Errours than are properly called Heresies. But for persons educated in a Church and thereby subject to it, and owing Canonical obedience not only (as they most weakly and wickedly imagine) to the Rule of Faith therein asserted, and maintained, but to the Rule of Unity and Communion outward, for such; I say, to divide from

from that Church which hath not by falling into notorious Heresies or Idolatrous practices, first fallen from Christian Faith, is to profess Schism. For to alledge that they would incorporate with the Church, if certain things which may possibly be parted with without destroying the Faith, at least immediately were granted to them, is to demand that their Superiors should bow to them, rather than they to their Superiors, and in effect to make the condition of their obedience and uniting with the Church, to be this, That first the Church should be of their Religion; the difference between them consisting in things in their own nature mutable. For though Faith consisteth in those things which are judged necessary in themselves to be received: Yet Religion is made up as well of the manner of serving God, as the material grounds of it. And therefore it is according to the manner of their treaties of peace in other Cases, to require the thing in debate to be granted them, before they will bear of a commodation or reconciliation. This senseless Charity is that of most Desperate Schismatics.

Yet not absolutely to despair of reducing some few of them, and much less of preventing the like ruine of souls in others, we shall now conclude with a few words concerning the *Second* thing in the beginning of this Point, *viz. The guilt of Schism*. Supposing then, what is above said, that Schism is a Causeless Separation from the Church of Christ, meaning by Causeless, not want of all reasons, or causes, but *Sufficient*, as are errors now mention'd in Faith; we farther understand by *Separation*, not that of the inward and hidden man, but outward and Visible; answerable to that we have called, and acknowledged to be properly called a Church, *i. e.* Visible. For possible we grant it is, what we do scarce believe to be actually true, (though we hear such things sometimes spoken) that dissenters may have a tolerable good opinion of a Church, as that it is a true Church in their private senses; they may pretend some general kindness and Charity to the Members of it: Nay they may hold it no grievous sin to communicate with it, for some persons especially: and yet for all this be rank Schismatics. For Schismatizing in its remoter Cause may spring from evil opinions and dispositions of the inward man; but its formality is altogether in outward profession of averesness, separation, and opposition to a Church. This is it which hath raised so much just clamour of the Ancient, and even of those very modern Persons who stomach nothing more than to be reduced to their own general Rules; and have worthily brandished their swords and pens to bring people to the unity of that Cause, which never was the true Faith, and to that Visible Company which never was a Church; and yet cannot understand their own language nor receive their own reasons and arguments in Cases infinitely more capable of such vindications, than the Party they created and asserted. Herein surely they have exceeded all other Factions in immodesty and undauntedness, that whereas those have been very scrupulous and sparing in delivering doctrines of coercion and constraint to unity, and therefore may (though with no reason, with some little colour) stand out against Unity, and oppose all Coaction thereunto: They of the *Presbyterian* Sect have preach'd, spoken, and written so much, and expressly against Schism, and the Liberty which tends necessarily to it, that it is beyond not only reason, but admiration, they should neither be affected with what other men have said against them, nor what they have unansweredly said against themselves, but proceed no otherwise than brutishly to hold their Conclusion, and stick to their inveterate errors, as if they could



could find no Church to unite to, or had no souls to save, or did not even according to their own principles run the apparent hazard of loosing them, by that sin which they confess is one of the Greatest Size, viz: unnecessary division. And unnecessary division themselves call, what is not for to avoid Idolatrous practises, or Heretical errors; and yet in their Apologies for themselves alledge none but frivolous instances tending, as they judge, to Superstition, wherein they prove themselves much more superstitious, by such religious opposition as they make against them; and deeply concerning their best Consciences, than they possibly can be, who for order sake, solemnity of worship, and conformity to the ancient Customs of Christs Church, and to avoid offence unto other Churches sticking inseparably unto them, retain rather than invent such adjuncts to Divine Religion.

It is hard to search out any new Topick from whence to draw out reasons against this hainous sin of Schismatizing, wherein I am not prevented by them disputing upon the false suppositions, that they at any time were a Church: and if they had been, that they who opposed them could be said to Divide Schismatically from them, of whose communion they never were, nor ever were obliged to be. They are therefore with others to consider, How solemn and severe a command of Christ they slight and contemn, who divide from a Church without more weighty exceptions than hitherto, have been offered by them, or heard by us. For passing by that which we now believe they could wish themselves unsaid, and are well content to lay aside, *Antichristianism, Popery, Baalism, Idolatry*, and what not of most foul, bitter, and false slanders and reproaches unbecoming the mouth of any sober Christian (with which notwithstanding they thriv'd so exceedingly at first into Power and estimation) there remains nothing now but such starv'd allegations and pittiful exceptions as may call in question their discretion, as well as conscience, to urge them. Will all the Prophecies and Prefigurations, and descriptions of the Old Testament concerning the unity of Christs Church under the Gospel; all the Predictions, Injunctions, Obtestations of Christ and his Apostles: All the solemn and Sacred Acts and Endeavours of Apostolical Postours to keep up unity in the Church: All the detestations of Discord and Disuniting: All the Denunciations of the most severe Judgements of God against causeless breakers of the Churches peace, be put off, and made void upon such sorry grounds as are of late found out to countenance separation. They are so well and generally known by frequent use, that, aiming at brevity here, I hold it not necessary to enlarge upon them, especially after so many who out of the Ancients have dissected this Monster, to the horror of any truly conscientious. Yet one or two I shall instance in *Dionysius Bishop of Alexandria*, as *Nicephorus Calixtus* relateth, affirmeth it to be no less glory, yea greater in his Judgement not to divide the Church, than not to sacrifice to Idols. Which in plain terms is to say, It is as great a sin to be a Schismatick as to be an Idolater, or yet more home to our Case, to be a Papist. *St. Augustine* tells us that it is manifest that he who is not a member of Christ, cannot have the salvation of a Christian. But the Members of Christ (he goes on) are conjoined together by the love or Charity of Unity, and by the same do stick to their Head, which Head is Christ Jesus. Now if it be impossible that any man should be a member of Christ the Head, who is not a member of his Body the Church, also; and that it is impossible a man should be a member of the Body from which he is divided; and that Schism doth

*Nicephor Calixt. Lib. 6. Cap. 4.*

*De Unitate Eccles. C. 2.*

to divide a man from the Body: How can a man that is a Schismatick be saved? Will they say by being of the Mystical Body of Christ; though not Visible? In this excuse they fall into many dangerous absurdities: First, in conceiving of Christs Visible Church as not the Mystical Body of Christ. For it is called Mystical not because it is internal and invisible, but because it is not a Natural, but a Spiritual Body: It is not a Political, as Political signifies *Civil or Humane Society*, but a Divine Body. It is not administered so much by Lawes of humane and common Invention as Spiritual. Secondly, In that it is supposed here, what we have before disproved that they are two distinct Bodies, *the Invisible and Mystical*, as they speak, from the Visible: So that a man may be of the one and not of the other: which cannot be understood: For though a man may not be Visibly of the outward Church, yet he must be and may be of the Visible Church. They are not Visibly of the Visible Church, who by far distance of Place and time are involuntarily separated from the Communion of the Church: but they who live within the communion of the Church and uncharitably divide from its communion are not of the Visible Church at all, nor yet, for ought can be made appear, of that they call Invisible; any more than an Heretick: For as the same St. *Augustin* saith in another place, *Neither the Heretick pertaineth to the Catholick Church, because he loveth not God, neither the Schismatick because he loveth not his neighbour.* And *Luther*, in his Colloquies tells us, that *The Heathen sins against God the Father, The Heretick against God the Son, And the Schismatick against God the Holy Ghost.* Therefore if there be such notorious guilt on the part of him that sinneth against the Holy Ghost, above that of him who sinneth against the Son, what mercy can they expect who thus wilfully offend? For who (saith *Augustin*) *fighteth with such evidence against the Holy Ghost, as he doth who rageth against the Church with such proud contentions.* Sectaries and Schismaticks have made way to their divisions, and alienations of mens minds and affections from the Church by reproaching it with Antichristianism, which if they could have in any sober or tollerable manner have made good, they needed nothing more to excuse them: but alas, they have the good Nature now to blush at such gross follies, and give over such foul slanders, though not the Grace to repent, which they can never do without a recognition of their error. But now they have almost done with that wicked lye, they must expect we should begin to tell them a manifest truth, That the Antichristianism is on their sides, upon many accountes: of which this of Schismatizing is a principal proof: as we and they both are taught by *Cyril of Jerusalem* thus, *Hatred of our brethren doth open a Gap to Antichrist: For the Devil doth prepare Schisms of the people (or Laity) that he who is to come may be more readily received.* These, and such like intollerable, if not unpardonable Evils of Schism made St. *Hierome* say plainly, that *Schism was worse than Heresie.* And so indeed it is, in this respect: that Heresie of itself, and own nature, ruineth only the person so infected: but Schism sweepeth away many from the truth, and Charity of the Church: As therefore it is better for a City that one man in it should die of the plague, than that through the infection of any one, the whole City should be troubled with the Itch, or some such disease which should make them all keep their beds, though possibly they may at length recover: so an Heretick in a Church not so divulging his error as to infect the Church in general, and thereby divide it from itself and others shall undoubtedly find an easier Judgement at Gods hands, than the Schismatick who dissolves the members of it from the Head, and one another, and doth far less mischief.

*Lib. De fide  
& Symb. C. 3.*

*Colloquia Men-  
salia.*

*Aug. Exposit.  
in Rom. incho-  
ata. To. 4.*

*Cyril. Hieron.  
Catic. pa. 161.*

*Hieron. contra  
Luciferanos.*

And

And whereas two things are popularly alledged in their Vindication, The one, that they would have lived in peace might those things have been granted which might have been yielded them, certain indifferent things, acknowledged to be so: And that they have done no otherwise than was done by the Church against the Church of *Rome* to reform against their consent. The First of these is in part very ridiculous, as we have shewed, and in part very false: Ridiculous it is, because it implies as much as to say, Give us but our demands and then we will be quiet: by which Rule no man should defend his own right in lesser matters, which to part with, perhaps would not utterly undo him; but he must be lookt on as necessary to, and guilty of his own destruction, if the Invader shall have power enough to bring it upon him, because he will not peaceably satisfy his unjust desires. A man may be (and our Saviour in the Gospel saith expressly, *Luk. 16. 10. 15.*) unjust in the least, as well as in much. And so undoubtedly are they, who, having no Authority but what they frame to themselves, shall by violence and aggressions attempt to extort the least thing belonging of right to another, though haply better spar'd than kept; For it is a Case of Justice, rather than Christianity. In justice and common equity, the inferior members of a Church and state, owe obedience to their Superiours, in all things not contrary to the Law of God, the Church, or the Nation: but at most, they can claim such things that are (as they say) indifferent to be granted them, out of Courtesie or Charity only. And whoever was so wilfully stupid as not to perceive that Injustice, is much more a sin than Uncharitableness; and so, whatever mischief or guilt shall fall out in such contentions, must necessarily light upon the heads of the unjust Aggressor, and not indiscreet Resister, were it indiscretion to withstand, to deny such bold and insolent demanders; or uncharitableness: both which are denied in the present Case. For there can be nothing more unjust on the one side, and unwise on the other, than so rudely and unrighteously to require of another all that may be granted; or to grant all such things as are so demanded. And if they urge still *The peace of the Church to require such concessions*: I shall answer, Let them first (as all good Christians ought to do) observe the Peace of Nature, and the Peace of Nations, which is not to offer violence, nor to be unjust, nor to go out of their Rank and Order, but with good Authority, and then take care for the Peace of the Church. But what can be more absurd, than that men should break the Peace of Nations and Nature it self, yea the Law of God and Scriptures, which require to obey all that are in authority over us, as well Ecclesiastically as Civilly, and then so much as to mention the Peace of the Church? especially calling that only the Peace of the Church which puts them into quiet possession of their desires. But to this we add, that it is also very false which is here supposed to be true. For there is nothing more manifest than that with diverse things of indifferent nature they mix many things of indispensable use to a Church: and such is that so much reproached and derided Hierarchy; which all the earth sees they have made it their business to Destroy utterly. And when we plainly see, as we do, that those things in nature indifferent are demanded chiefly as an introduction to a farther abolition of things we hold necessary, we hold them no longer indifferent; nor can we in common prudence or Christianity part with them to such persons; any more than we can in a neighbourly manner lend away an Ax or Hammer, when we are assured, they will be made use of to break open our houses and spoil us, though we know they may possibly be made use of to other purposes.

The



The Second Obstacle, rather than Objection cast in our way is the parity of their Case with the Church of England, with that of the Church of England with the Roman: wherein whether they show more Spite or Policy, may be a question: Their Policy imitates them, who finding the war to lie heavy upon them at their own doors, contrive by all means possible to translate it into another Country: as was particularly seen in *Hindersons* Letter to his late Sacred Majesty, who finding the ability of his pen and weight of his discourses, advised him rather to turn himself against the common enemy, the Papist: And thus these men would needs oblige us to make our quarrel good against the Romanists, that they may be the less molested in the pursuance of their most Schismatical designs against the Church in which they were educated. And this being discovered, we might well excuse ourselves from such a task as they would set us. But this we have before resolved in good part: and had we not, might, and shall in a very few words dispatch, as somewhat out of its proper place. We grant then, there is a Schism between us and the Romanists. And we grant that there can be no cause to be Schismatics, though for a Separation there may: and that they are truly Schismatics who have ministred just Cause of Separation. Some we know, out of an ancient Father, have urged against us, That there can be no cause to divide the Church: which is true in two senses only: First, when that Church is not before really divided from other Churches of unquestion'd integrity; *Really* I say, by deserting some considerable point of Faith, or introducing some unchristian manner of worship, though not *Openly* and *Formally*, as hath been said. Again, it is true only in such junctures as the Father spake those words in, which was an apt and orthodox agreement within itself, both in Faith and manners: in such Cases there can be no cause to divide the Church, as did the *Novatians* and *Donatists*. But it was never his purpose to say that no case could happen in which it was not lawful for one Church to leave the Communion of another; when it was so often done. So still the point is wholly, whether cause was given or not, and not whether such outward, and wilful Separation was made. For undoubtedly, however some would mince the matter, Separate we did, and that wilfully from the Church of *Rome*; and chose, rather than were forced to go out. And upon those very grounds we still stand out and refuse to return, The gross corruptions there maintained and not lurking: and the fear of the loss of our souls in there continuing, and much more thither returning. What those are, hath been even now touched; and we here add, that notwithstanding 'tis confessed such senses are found of their doctrine and superstitious worship in some private authors amongst them, which they offer at first to them they would seduce, which may put persons into a possibility of their continuing, without incurring damnation; yet the Publick authority of that Church (which I suppose they will call their Church) having evermore of late years, censur'd, purged, and expunged such more tollerable constructions; and appeared for the most harsh, and uncatholick, there can be no great regard had to the fairer opinions. Again, it is not sufficient that a Church hath a true sense of Christian Faith, if it alloweth and commendeth a false and a wicked sense. 'Tis little to the purpose, or to their advantage, to say (for instance sake) as the more sober, especially when they would gain upon the good opinion of men, That Images may be worshipped relatively and as instruments to devotion and helps, but when there are found, and generally known to be such doctrines as teach a veneration of Images for their own sakes, and directly, and that with the same sort of worship that the things they represent

I;  
present

present are capable of; (though perhaps they upon a pinch can insert a distinction which neither can be understood nor profit) such a doctrine as this known to be delivered by the Principal Doctors of their Churches and maintain'd, not being condemned by that Church (however not generally embraced) may subject a Church to a censure of Heresie and Idolatry of both: and so in other things, wherof tolerable senses are given in the Church of *Rome*; or else they could not be said so much as to be a Church at all; but intolerable and Heretical are also uncondemned, and so are no true Church: and so may be separated from, without Schism, but not without peril of damnation united to. And do not our brethren (for such they were before they professed Schism, and I hope may be after they have renounced it) see now plainly enough the vanity and spitefulness of their Evasion? Are not the Cases infinitely different, and that in their own eyes? Hear they what *Perkins* saith to our, and their purpose; *So long as a Church or people do not Separate from Christ, we may not separate from them.* 2 *Pro.* 24. 21. *Fear the King and meddle not with them that vary, i. e. make alterations against the Laws of God, and the King. Indeed Subjects may signifie what is good for the State, and what is amiss; but to make any alteration in the State either Civil, or Ecclesiastical, belongs to the Supream Magistrate.* And in another place the same Author hath these words, *Great therefore is the rashness and want of moderation in many that have been of us, that condemn our Church for no Church, without sufficient conviction going before. If they say, we have been admonished by books published, I say again, these be grosser faults in some of those books, than any of the faults that they reprove in the Church of England, and therefore the books are not fit to convince especially a Church.*

*Perkins on Gal.  
C. 5. V. 20.*

*Jd. Galat 1. V.  
2.*

Thus we see how the cases in the matter differ. And no less may we see the difference in the manner. For 'tis apparent that Schismatics against the Church of England never had any Legal authority to warrant their vile and Scandalous practices: but were forced to give names to things incapable of them, to excuse themselves; or else by an unnatural course to entitle the People to a Power Supream, who have none at all, but what is given them from another fountain: neither did the people concur with such misde-meaners, as was pretended they did. But thirdly, another difference is to be noted from the Rights of a Patriarchal Power over a Provincial Church, not properly of its Dioceses, and that of a Metropolitan with his Suffragans over the members of the Church which they altogether make. For, according to the constitutions of the Church, though a Patriarchs Power was *Intensively* equal to Episcopal, over his proper and immediate Diocese, and *Extensively* much greater than the Metropolitans or Bishops in relation to other Diocesses: yet was it never so Intensive *i. e.* so particular and great in those Bishops Diocesses over which he had only an Order of Unity rather than Intrinsick power to dispose matters therein, though in process of time this also was invaded much by him, and might be recovered to the proper Bishop by the Laws of the Church. But the Bishops of this Church had the sole and immediate disposing of the affairs of it, and nothing could be concluded without obligation of obedience out of Conscience, without their Concurrence, as desperately as Schismatics then did and still do rage at this truth. But then, as *Hinderson* saith with others, *They would never reform themselves.* It is very likely so, meaning, as they would have them; but that, not to the better Rule of the Ancient Churches, and the Scriptures, is more than they knew, or would acknowledg when they saw; because still they would have done otherwise, and invented a new Rule of their own.

But

But seeing the grounds and Cause of separation are they upon which the Guilt of Schism is avoided or contracted according to the nature of them, and obscure and difficult, and tedious is the method leading to the tryal of the sufficiency of them, to justify a Separation; therefore it were well contrived, if, as in the search of a true Church, they may, being very long and uncertain and grievous to most, proceeding upon the points of Faith and Parts of worship themselves, certain infallible obvious and plain Characters could be produced to convince the Schism, and distinguish it from simple and innocent Separation. A Fair attempt to which hath been made by *Austin*, who disputing against the *Donatists* denies that any man can separate from the Universal Church, innocently. So that although it should be doubtful (as most things are managed by Learned Partisans) whether, considering the grounds of Separation in themselves, the Separation be Schismatical, or lawful and laudable; yet by such an outward Characteristick, it might be competently discerned. And so far must I needs comply with that Judicious and Holy Father, and such as urge this out of him against us, as to yield it a most probable outward Note of Schism, for any man, or number of men, not a Church, but in *Fieri* (as they speak) only, and in breeding, to divide from the Universal Church: not only as comprehending all Ages, but of any one Age: the weight and evidence of which Concession will appear from the esteem of the Church Catholick, and the wrath and extent of Christs promises to preserve it in All truth. For this is certain, That Christ directed his promises and restrained them to no one time or Age. And it is not probable there should be such an Intercession or intermission of Faith or Christianity, that the universal Church should mortally err in any one thing necessary to salvation; nay, though we take it not in such a large sense as sometimes it is wont to be used, for all individual persons in it, as well as Churches of which the whole is constituted. And therefore to desert the communion of all Churches, not of persons (for this is scarce to be supposed to happen at any time) doth argue shrewdly, That the separation hath much of Schism in it; without examination of particular grounds which are pretended sufficient. For it will be said That it ought not to be supposed that Christ should deliver over his whole Church to such heretical errors, which only can exempt a Separation from Schism. From such notorious suspicions as these we may clear our selves thus. First, by putting a difference between the Church so united as is here supposed to rightly denominate it the *Catholick* or *Universal* Church, and the Church disunited and divided long before any Reformation came to be so much as called for in these western Parts, with attempts to put such desires into practice. The division or Schism between the Western and Eastern Churches happened about the years 860 and 870, under *Nicholas* the first of *Constantinople*, and *Adrian* the Second, Bishop of *Rome*. Where the guilt was, is of another subject. But the Schism rested not here, but infested the Greek Church also, subdividing the *Armenian* from the *Constantinopolitan*. Now in such Case as this, which is as much different from that of the *Donatists* who divided from all these entirely united together, as may be, who can conclude a Division from the Church so divided long before, a Schism *ipso facto*, because a Division was made from one Part of it calling itself indeed the Catholick Church? Had therefore Reformers so divided from the Catholick Church united, as did the *Donatists*, it were more than probable that their division might from thence be known to be Schism without any more ado: but it is certain it was quite otherwise. And therefore some other Conviction must be expected, besides that Characteristick. I i 2 And



And what must that be? The Infallibility of any one Eminent Church, which like a City on a Mountain, a Beacon on a Hill, a Pharos or Light-tower to such as are like to shipwrack their Faith, may certainly direct them to a safe Station and Haven? And all this to be the Church or See of *Rome*? But alas, though this were as desirable as admirable, yet we have nothing to induce us to receive it for such, but certain prudent inferences that such there is, because such there ought to be for the ascertaining dubious minds in the truth; and therefore so (say they) actually it is: and lest humane reason should seem too malapert to teach what divine Authority ought to do, therefore must the Scripture be canvass'd and brought against the best Presidents in Antiquity, to the Contrary; to Patronize such necessary Dogms. The matter then returns to what we at first propounded: *viz.* the Judging of Schism from the Causes, and of the Causes, from the Scriptures, and the more Genuine and ancient Traditions of Christs Church, before such Schism distracted the same. These two things therefore we leave to be made Good by Romanists, in which they are very defective: First, that there is any One Notorious infallible Judge actually constituted, whereby we may certainly discern the Schismaticalness, or Hereticalness of any one Church varying from the truth: and this because, It were to be wish'd a Judge were somewhere extant. Secondly, that what ever Security or Safety of Communion is to be found in the Visible Church, properly and inseparably belongs to the Roman Church; because some of the Ancients tell, the time when it did not actually err. But if our proofs be much more strong and apparent, which declare that actually it doth err, and wherein it doth err, what an empty and bootless presumption must it needs be, to invite to its communion upon her immunity from Erring? or to condemn men of Schism for this only, That they communicate not with it? which is the bold method of Roman Champions.

THE

T H E  
Second BOOK  
O F T H E  
FIRST PART.

C H A P. I.

*Of the Formal Object of Christian Faith, Christ.  
An Entrance to the treating of the Objects of  
Faith in Particular.*



ND Thus far have we treated of Religion in General: and specially of Christian Religion or Faith in its Rule, the Scriptures; Its Causes; its Effects, its Contraries, its Subject, the Church, in its several Capacities: Now we are briefly to treat of the Particular Object, Christian Faith.

That as God is the true and proper Author of Christian Faith, he is also the principal Object, is most certain and apparent; and is therefore, by the Schools called the *Formal Object*, that is, either that which it immediately and most properly treats of, or for whose sake, other things spoken of, besides God, and Christ, are there treated of. For other Religions as well as Christian, treat of God, and the works of God; but none treat of God or his works, as consider'd in Christ his Son, but the Christian. For the two Greatest Acts which have any knowledge of, of God, being Creation and Redemption, both these are described unto us in Holy Writ to be wrought by God through Christ Jesus: as the Book of *Proverbs* and of *Wisdom* intimate to us, when they shew how God in *Wisdom* made the Worlds: Christ being the true Wisdom of the Father. And more expressly in the entrance into the Gospel of St. *John*, the Word of God, being Christ, is said to be in the beginning with God, and *All things were made by him and without him was not any thing made that was made.* And St. *Paul* to the *Ephesians* affirmeth, *All things to be created by God, by Jesus Christ.* And to the *Colossians* speaking of Christ the Image of the Invisible God, addeth, *For by him were all things created that are in Heaven, and that are in the Earth Visible and Invisible, &c.* This therefore discriminates

*John* 1. 2, 3

*Eph.* 3. 9.

*Col.* 1. 15, 16.

nates the treating of things natural in Christian Theologie from all other Sciences and Theologies, that all is spoken of in relation to Christ Jesus.

Therefore having in the beginning of this Tract spoken of God in General, as supposed rather than to be proved in Divinity, *viz.* of his Absolute Being: his Unity, being but one; His Infiniteness, being all things in Perfection and Power; we are here to resume that matter, and continue it by a more particular enquiry into the Nature, Attributes, Acts, and Works of God: here supposing what before we have spoken of the First notion of Gods Being, and those immediately joined with them, His Unity, and Infiniteness: which Infiniteness necessarily inferreth all other Attributes proper to him, as of Power, Presence in all places, and all times, and Omniscience: and therefore here we shall speak only of the Nature, or Being of God in the more peculiar sense to Christians, that is, being distinct in Persons, as well as One in Nature.

## CHAP. II.

### *Of the special consideration of God as the object of Christian Faith, in the Unity of the Divine Nature, and Trinity of Person.*

**F**ROM the Unity or singularity of Gods nature as to number, doth flow an Unity and Simplicity of that one Individual Nature in it self. For as the Nature of God cannot be found in several and separate Persons subsisting by themselves, as may the nature of man: so neither ought we to imagin that there is multiplicity of natures constituting the same God. For as there are not many Gods differing Generically, as there are Bodies Celestial, and Bodies Terrestrial; and again, of Terrestrial, some Bodies Elemental and uncompounded naturally; Other Mixt and compounded: and such are Fish, Fowl, and Beasts; neither can there many as different in kind, as Man and Beast are distinct; nor in number, as men differ one from another, so neither can there be One differing as it were from it self, in Parts, or other like composition of nature, as man doth. For seeing (as *Boetius* hath observed) God is that which is most absolute and perfect; and than which nothing more excellent can be conceived by the mind of man: If more than one could be in nature, or number, there could not be one most absolute: but One more absolute and simple might by the Understanding of Man, be conceived, which necessarily must be thought to be God rather than those diverse ones. And if we should suppose the Nature Individual of God to be made up of several sorts of things, and nature as the Body of man, then did we not pitch upon the true Notion of God: which we must alwayes suppose to be most perfect: But we have more than conjectural knowledge that some things in the world are not compounded, at least as we are; but of a more pure and simple substance: such as we call Spirit. And we may well believe that all of that nature are not of equal perfection: or if possibly they should, that still



still there is a possibility of a more transcendent purity of subsisting than they are of, until we come to the most absolute, pure, and perfect *Being*, than which nothing can be, or conceived to be more Pure, and Perfect: and that must of necessity be God. Again, such a composition would destroy the nature of God, because such it must be that nothing either in act or Cogitation, can possibly precede it: but where there are distinct parts, or humors concurring to make one Entire thing, there a real priority at least of nature, must needs be: because it cannot be supposed but the Cause must in some manner go before the Effect, and such supposed compositions have of the nature of a material Cause to such a thing, as they so constitute. Thirdly, all things of a differing nature concurring to make *One*, cannot move themselves, nor of themselves meet with such concord as to make one thing without the power and wisdom of some third Superiour Agent bringing them so together. So that to suppose such a God, is to suppose one Above, and before him; who should Effect all this which is repugnant to the nature of God. Lastly, nothing can be so well set together but it may be supposed to be undone and dissolved again, either by the nature of things themselves tending to separation, or by the same power, or, if they will, fortune (as some have called it) which brought them together.

This is yet further confirmed unto us from the Holy Scriptures: which were best able to reveal the nature of God unto us so far as was expedient, or perhaps, for us in this life, possible to understand: where God most admirably describeth himself thus, *I am that I am*: which is his name for ever, which no created thing can claim to it. The like to which is that name *Jehovah*, whereby he calls himself, signifying an absolute essential Being. For nothing besides God can define God. Every thing but he, is defined by another thing, which differs in some manner from it: but God is defined by himself, because nothing can be Higher than he, and nothing in him is really distinct from him, as in other things. And therefore truly may it be said of God, *The Lord thy God is one Lord, i. e. One in number, nature, and Simplicity of Being*. And therefore, such definitions of God as this, *God is a Spirit or Substance, Spiritual, Uncreated, Most Pure, Eternal, Infinite, Incomprehensible, Immutable, Everliving, &c.* Are rather to be understood Negatively than Positively: that is, that God is so a Spirit that he is infinitely above the nature of Corporeal Beings: though he be not so a Spirit as to be of the Nature of Angels or such like Spirits, but much more transcends them in excellency, than they do the most gross and earthly Bodies: And said to be Infinite because no limitation of his Being, or Power, or Presence can be supposed: which is commonly called the Negative way of attaining knowledg of Gods nature, *viz.* by removing, or excluding all imperfections of the Creature from God the Creatour. And Positively ascribing all things to him, which appear to humane understanding most Perfect, and Excellent.

Exod. 3. 14,  
15.

Deut. 6. 4.

Joh. 4. 24.  
1 Tim. 1. 17.  
Rom. 1. 25.  
Psal. 90. 2.  
Jer. 23. 23. 34.  
Psal. 130. v. 7.  
1 Tim. 6. 16.

## CHAP. III.

*Of the Unity of the Divine Nature as to the Simplicity of it. And how the Attributes of God are consistent with that Simplicity.*

**B**UT against the fore said Simplicity seem to make several things ascribed unto God and believed of him: as First, Attributes of God, as *Most Holy, Most Wise, most Just, Most Merciful*, and such like. Secondly, the descriptions made of God in Holy Scripture. Thirdly, The Existence of God in a triplicity of Persons. Of the first we shall here speak most briefly, as no difficulty. For we are to understand them, not as really distinct things from the Nature of God himself; which is most simple, but only Relatively, and after the manner of mans conception: who being able no otherwise than from sensible and natural occasions, to understand God, must of necessity frame to himself such affections; and severally distinguish them, for to exercise the several Acts of Service due to God: For if Man consider'd God altogether under one manner of Being: then could he not sometimes humble himself under his wrath, and displeasure conceived for his sins: Then could he not, at other times, rejoyce in his mercy, and express his thankfulness for his grace and Goodness received. Then could he not implore his aid against unjust dealings and injuries suffered in the world. Then could he not Pray unto him, to relieve him in his necessities, and straits: none could crave supply from his bounty and fulness in his wants. These distinct conceptions therefore of God are requisite, though God be absolutely the same. And God having vouchsafed to express himself in such manner in his Word, doth thereby give warrant for us to be affected: alwayes provided that we proceed not to any gods imagination of him as really so affected and compounded; but according to a *Metaphorical* or *Metonymical* sense, familiarly used in all authors as well as in the Scriptures. For it is to be noted, the Scriptures do choose to speak in compliance with mans capacity, not according to the dignity of the subject, of which it treats, nor according to the Splendour and illuminated state of the Understandings receiving divine Revelations, but according to the proportion of mens ordinary apprehensions, to which they are directed; as Philosophy hath observed that All Agents do work agreeable to the condition of the Patient or thing that suffereth, not according to the full force and vertue which it hath in it self. For fire doth not equally prey upon stone and wood: nor doth the Physitian give the same strong Physick to a weak body as he doth to a strong, nor are Men informed of God, after the manner of Angels, who behold much more purely and cleerly the Nature of God. But mans knowledge is generally taken from the Effects. And so comparing those works of God, and Acts of God, which have some similitude with those of men. For as all works of note do imply some care and pains to produce them by men; So is God said to labour when he created all things in this world: and to rest, when he had finished and ended all: because this is the manner of men: And to be Angry when either just cause is offered

Ἐπίσης φαίνεται  
θεωρίας καὶ  
ἀνθρωπίνων  
ἀσθενειῶν.  
Ἀνάξια ῥη-  
ματὰ μετὰ  
δοξάν ἐκείνῳ  
ὁ Θεός, ἵνα καὶ  
ἔτι διαβλέ-  
ψας, καὶ μὴ γὰρ  
καὶ ὁ ἄνθρωπος ἐν-  
νοήσας.  
Chrysost.  
Homil. 13.  
in Joann.

offered by offending him, in breaking of his holy Laws, or the effects of wrath commonly seen, when men are so affected appear by the severe punishments inflicted upon offenders.

And what is said of the inward affections ascribed unto God, may be easily applied to those outward descriptions made of God in Scripture, under the form of Man, as of Hands, Arms, Head, Heart, Eyes, and such like; which the ancient Fathers against the Hereſie of the *Anthropomorphites*, who (as *Epicurus* in *Tully*) took God to be of the ſame faſhion and form with Man, do affirm to be by *Condeſcenſion* to Man; which *Condeſcenſion* is thus deſcribed by one [*Συνκατάβασις*] *Condeſcenſion* is when God doth ſeem to be what he is not, but ſo declares himſelf to be, as he that is to conceive of him, is beſt able to behold him, proportioning the revelation of himſelf to the imbecillity of the contemplator.

*Συνκατάβασις*, often mentioned by St. Chryſoſtome. *Suidas*.

#### CHAP. IV.

*Of the Unity of the Divine Nature as to number, and how the Trinity of Persons may conſiſt with the Unity and ſimplicity of the Deity. Of the proper Notions pertaining to the Myſtery of the Trinity, viz. Eſſence, Subſtance, Nature, Perſon. The Diſtinction of the Perſons in the Trinity. Four Enquiries moved. How far the Gentiles and Jews underſtood the Trinity. The Proof of the Doctrine of the Trinity from the New Teſtament, and the Explication of it.*

**B**UT to the exception taken from the Myſtery of the Holy Trinity, greater regard ought to be had, as well for the explication and confirmation of that Doctrine, as for the ſatisfaction of humble enquirers into the ſame. And for more clear and gradual proceeding herein, it will be requiſite firſt to explain ſuch terms as this Doctrine much depends on, as Eſſence, Subſtance, Nature, Perſon and Trinity it ſelf.

*Eſſence* is of ſomewhat larger extent than *Subſtance*, becauſe *Subſtance* ſignifies properly only that which is oppoſite to Accident, or that which adheres or inheres to Subſtance: but *Eſſence* ſignifies all kinds of Beings, as well of Accidents, as Subſtances. Nature is the reſtraint of Eſſence and Subſtance both, in their general Being, to ſome more ſpecial kind of thing; as there is the Nature of Man, and the Nature of Beaſt, the Nature of Accidents, and the Nature of Subſtances, the Nature of Colours, and



the Nature of Quantities : so that Nature is not that whereby a thing simply and absolutely is, but whereby it is what it is. Hence we say also, the Nature of God or the Creator, and the Nature of the Creature ; Nature being that by which, as is said, a thing is what it is, and distinct from others. And as for the word *Trinity*, it is true what hath been objected by some of old, that it is not in terms to be found in Scripture ; for the word doth not import any one or more things absolutely, but rather the manner of such things being, the better to settle the mind in the apprehension of that great Mystery. Now the Holy Scriptures doth very often only propound the Article of Faith to be believed by us, but leaves the manner of expressing and conceiving the same to the holy prudence of Men, whom he hath for the instruction of inferior persons ordained in his Church, which have agreed so to term that three-fold personal Relation, in the Deity. A *Person* is defined to be an entire and absolute Being, of reasonable nature. Man in general is not a Person, because he subsisteth not by himself. A Beast in particular is not a Person, because void of knowledge and reason. The soul of Man, though endowed with reason, is not a Person, because not of it self entire and perfect, being part of another thing, *i. e.* Man. But *Peter* and *John* are Persons, because single Substances, absolute in themselves, and rational.

To collect therefore, and conclude from what is thus briefly premised, we say, that these Notions of *Essence*, *Substance* and *Nature*, are sometimes taken more strictly and properly ; according to which we must alwayes hold it as a most fundamental Truth in Christian Religion, as it is in the Religion of all civilized People, that God is but one in Essence, Substance, or Nature, *i. e.* the Being and Nature of God, as God, are but one. But if we take the said Notions more largely, for that which expresses the manner of Being, as well as Being it self, then may we speak of the nature of a Person ; as when we say, that the nature of a Person is different from the nature of things simply taken. And if Nature be taken, as sometimes, for the condition of a thing or Person, we may truly say, that in the Trinity, the Three Persons, as Persons, are of a different nature, though they differ not in the nature of the Deity : For, that they really, and not imaginarily, or by mans fancy and conception different from one another, is a received Truth by all, reputed true Believers ; but nothing can be distinct from another, but by somewhat peculiar to it, and whatever is peculiar to a thing, and *ingredient* into its Being, may be, and is commonly called the nature of it ; in which sense we may say, Three Persons are of a different nature, because the Father is not the Son, nor the Son the Father, nor the Holy Ghost Father or Son ; for the nature of the Father, as Father, is to beget ; the nature of the Son, as Son, to be begotten ; the nature of the Holy Ghost, as Holy Ghost, to proceed. But all this hindereth not in the Nature of God they should be one and the same, and so but one distinct God ; and this makes the Trinity in Unity, and the Unity in Trinity : For were not the Persons distinct by somewhat real, and not so notional as to be fictitious, there could not be said to be a Triplicity or Trinity of Persons. And again, if in nature they were not the same, there could be no Identity worthy of that Mystery : For other Creatures differing one from another in subsisting distinctly, agree in the unity of a general nature, as three men agree in the common nature of man. But 'tis otherwise in the sacred Mystery of the Persons and Nature of God ; for the Nature of God is numerically the same, and yet is without inequality or division,

division, communicated totally and entirely to every Person. Again, other Persons are of a distinct subsistence, that is, subsist apart; but the Persons in the Trinity *subsist* not distinctly, because all equally have their subsistence in that Divine Nature; but they may be said to *exist* distinctly, or have a diversity of existence, as they are so many Persons.

*Vide Ruffinum  
Hisor. Eccles.  
l. 1. c. 29.*

From the Point thus briefly opened and stated, these four things are to be asserted and believed: First, That God is but one in Nature. Secondly, That there is a three-fold Personality in that Divine Nature. Thirdly, That these three are distinct, and how. Fourthly, That they are the same in subsisting. Of the first it hath in the beginning been sufficiently spoken, and may well here be taken for granted. The second is now to be explained, and that in these following Enquiries: First, By the Grounds of Natural Reason. Secondly, The Grounds of the Old Testament for the same. Thirdly, The Opinion of the Church of the Jews concerning the Trinity. Fourthly, The Grounds of the Gospel founding this Doctrine.

The reason why the first is called in question, is because God is generally affirmed both by the Histories of all Ages and People, to be known to the Gentiles naturally; *i. e.* by a connatural Instinct; and that many of them did worship the true God, according to that Law and State of Nature in which they lived. But if God essentially and immutably consists of three Persons in one Nature Divine, they that worshipped God otherwise than in the Holy Trinity, worshipped him not as he is, and they that worship him not as he is, worship a false God, and they that worship a false God, worship an Idol. And hence it is that divers learned men have said, They who worship God out of the Trinity, worship an Idol, and not the true God; which severe Argument concludes as well against the Jews, as Gentiles; if, as some believe, they understood not God in the Trinity, but worshipped him in the simplicity of a Deity only according to the way of Nature. But if this only men were taught by nature, (for that men were by a light of nature led to worship not only God, but one God, Reason and the Scriptures inform us) that they should worship a God, and him alone, and did not intimate withal so much of the true Nature of God, as was absolutely necessary to be known, to the worshipping the true; what benefit could it be to man, to have such an imperfect knowledge of him, whenas still he must worship an Idol, God being the same under the Law of Nature, as he is under the Gospel of Grace? For as that man who acknowledgeth but one God, should commit Idolatry, who should strongly imagine and firmly perswade himself that God was of the fashion and form of Man, and worship him as such a one, sitting in a fair and glorious room in Heaven: So no less in reason doth it seem, that he should in like manner offend, who doth believe no distinction of the Deity into the Trinity of Persons, but acknowledges but one Person in the Divine Nature. The reason of both is, because he worships him neither way as he is, and that not in relative Attributes in order to us, but absolute, essential manner of Being. Now no man that thinks of another otherwise than he is in Essence, thinks really of that, but some other thing.

To vindicate then both Jew and Gentile from such gross error, even in the Object of Worship, and not only them, but Nature it self from misinforming them; it is said, that the Gentile had some light apprehension of the Deity under this notion: And that first from Tradition of the most ancient Patriarchs, who undoubtedly were sufficiently instructed in that

Zib. 10. &amp; 11.

Deity. And that this Tradition was so conveyed to the ears of some prime Philosophers, or exposed to their view in the monuments of ancient dayes, that they have committed the same to writing, as divers of their Books still extant intimate unto us, though obscurely. Secondly, The many footsteps of this great Mystery found in the course of Nature, do (according to many wise men) suggest to an attentive mind the Nature of God, as now received, which others have at large pursued; imitating herein St. *Augustine* in his Book of the Trinity, wherein he endeavoureth to describe the manner of this Mystery from the internal senses of Understanding, Will and Memory; and external, of Apprehension, Imagination and common Sensation, all which agree in one, and proceed from one. But in this method no sure footing can be found, for more serious and solid certification of a man, though we should yield some glimpses of that divine light to shine from thence; for the Book of the Creature wherein God is to be read, doth not deliver all things equally clear to us: But first, having plainly made known the thing it self, leaves us to seek from what we know imperfectly of God, to procure by due worship and Petition a farther insight into that mystery, which being in some measure better instructed in from above, things below may confirm us in the same.

Thirdly, It seems to me that naturally (not taking Nature strictly for a necessary and full assurance, but tacit, at least, intimation) there is implied somewhat of the Trinity of Persons, from the too common error of acknowledging more Gods than one. For (as we have said) it being a Doctrine of Nature no less apparent that God is one, than that he is simply, it could scarce become so general an error, that men should contrary to such natural light, worship a plurality or variety of Gods, but that there was somewhat received together with that Principle, which might incline and expose them to error; and that was a general Notion, whether by Tradition or Nature, that the Divine Nature was diversified: But how this could consist with the other Principle, not being capable to understand, they easily fell from their first, and more sound Notion of the Unity of the Divine Nature, and took up the opinion of many Gods distinct, as well in Nature it self, as Persons. And do we wonder that they should forsake the truest notion of a Deity in this abstruseness, when in those things that are confessedly clear to ordinary Reasons by nature, they degenerated to a little less than brutish stupidity, being, as the Scriptures tell us, of some *things willingly ignorant*.

2 Pet. 3. 5.

But it were much more absurd, that the peculiar people of God, the Jews, should be ignorant of this so necessary a Point; and yet we find that now-adays they declare against it expressly, denying withal this to have been any branch of the Faith professed by their Progenitors. But we need not be very anxious about their Authority now adays, it being most easie to be made apparent, in how many and great things they have degenerated in their Doctrine and Worship, since it pleased God to withdraw his holy Spirit from that Church, upon their rejecting of the true Messiah sent them, and to translate it to the Church of the Gentiles. And no wonder that they who observe not that now, should argue against it, as a thing not to be done; and moreover deny that ever it was believed or practised by their Forefathers, for there remains no other way to excuse themselves in their present error, but to maintain that it was never otherwise held. This is a common evasion of all Hereticks and Sectaries: But that the Scriptures of the Old Testament contained this Doctrine in substance, though the



the more perspicuous and glorious manifestation of the same was reserved for the New, is not to be denied; especially if we consider how that many of their own Doctors and Rabbies have so interpreted the same. And some have admired the Hebrew Language as the holy Tongue; not so much (as some of moderns standing amongst them have given out) because of the neat and modest expression of things of impure and obscene nature; for it is very plain, that the most obscene things are there as broadly and manifestly expressed as elsewhere, but from the matter which it treats of generally, very divine; and particularly from the nature of that Tongue, in every word of which being a Radix or original, the Mystery of the Trinity is implied, in that it consists but of three principal Letters, which Letters make but one word. But there are more sure words of Prophecy than they, and such are these, together with the Comment and approbation of the Chaldee Paraphrast, *Gen. 3. v. 8.* it is said, *They heard the voice of the Lord God walking in the Garden*; which words *Onkelos* renders thus, *And they heard the voice of the Word of the Lord God*; where we see that *Voice* and *Word* are distinguished, the one being taken for the Word spoken, the other for the Word subsisting, or personal. And again, *v. 22.* where the Hebrew hath, *And the Lord God said, &c. Jonathans*, or as some more properly, the Hierusalem Targum hath, *The Word of the Lord said.* And the same Hierusalem Targum on *Deuteronomy* the 33. 7. hath, *The Word of the voice of the Lord heard Judah*, where the Original and other Translations have, *Hear Lord, or receive Lord, the voice of Judah.* And so in other places; which doth argue a Personality ascribed unto the Word of God: Which doth farther appear, for that the action of Creation, extending the Heavens, and Repenting, is attributed unto the Word of God.

But I leave the asserting of the Mystery of the Trinity from the Scriptures of the Old Testament, interpreted by the learnedst and most renowned of the Jewish Doctors, to such who have made it their design to convince them from testimonies of their own Authors, as *Petrus Galatinus*, and more exactly, *Josephus de Voisin*, in his Comments on *Prælogo Christianæ Fidei*, and especially, *de Trinitate*. I shall only add here that memorable passage in *Bibliander*, out of the Jewish Rabbies, upon that place in *Gen. 28.* *And he lighted upon a certain place, and tarried there all night, because the Sun was set, and he took of the stones of the place, and put them for his pillows, and lay down in that place to sleep.* Where some Rabbies (saith *Bibliander*) do understand, that he took two stones; but others, as *Rabbi Nechemias*, that he took three, and in this manner prayed to God; *If God shall write his Name upon me, as he did his Name upon mine Ancestors, let all these become one, and he found them all one*: By which type of the stone they give to understand, God to be the Original of all things; for the word [אבן] which in Hebrew is a stone, implies in a mystery, the Trinity; for in *Aben* intimates the Father; *Ben* signifies the Son; and *N.* *Neshanna* or Spirit: Thus they. Which their interpretation, whether it hath not more of wit than solid Argument, I am not here to determine, it sufficing our present purpose, to shew that the Doctrine of the Trinity is no invention of Christians, as modern Jews vainly give out; for if their forefathers mention the same, though their grounds may not be of the soundest, it argues they knew and received it.

Other Texts from the Old Testament implying this Mystery, are chiefly these; *2 Sam. 23. 2.* *Isa 48. 16, 17.* and *chap. 61. 1.* and *chap. 63. 9.* *Psal. 33. 6.* compared with *Joh. 1. 1, 2, 3.* *Haggai 2. 5.* compared with *Gen.*

1.26.

*Gen. 3. 8.*

*Bibliander de  
Paschate Is-  
rael.  
Gen. 28. 11.*

Pfal. 110.

Matth. 22. 42.

1. 26. *Iſa.* 6 3, &c. Concerning all which it is to be observed; First, That it is not to be expected the testimonies of the Old Testament, whose design it was to deliver all things more covertly and obscurely, should be altogether so *literally* and *expresly* taken, as that none other may be found as proper as that sence given by Christians; but it may suffice, that an apt accommodation may be made to the confirmation of our Faith, and that by the chief enemies to it. Secondly, That the Tradition of the Jewish Church differed from the historical or literal sence. Hence our Saviour Christ proves the Messias to be God, out of *Pſalm* 110. v. 1. *The Lord said unto,* &c. arguing to this effect, He who was greater than *David* himself, from whom the Messias should come, must needs be God, *David* calling him, in Spirit, *Lord*; but *David*, in Spirit, calls the Messias *his Lord*, whereas *David* being himself absolute Sovereign, had no mortal greater than he, therefore he must be God. This was then generally received amongst the wisest of them, That the Messias was there intended, though the words might be capable of a more literal sence. And the like may we judge of the Arguments of *St. Paul*, drawn out of the Old Testament, to confirm the Doctrine of the New, and particularly this; for it is confessed that he bringeth many proofs, as do also the other sacred Pen-men out of the Books of the Old Testament, which have a literal sence much differing from that purpose to which they are alledged. But it is certain that the ancient Jews did maintain two senses, a *Literal*, and a *Mystical*; and that *St. Paul* being educated in the prime Traditions and Mysteries of their Divinity, used them according to the known sence of the learned: For otherwise it had been as easie then for the Jews to have put in their exceptions against his Doctrine, as now it is for Jews to cavil at them.

Matth. 28. 19.

Acts 20. 28.

But besides the Authority of the Old Testament, principally to be used against Jews, the Authority of the New must be enforced against the Heresies of Christians against this great Mystery. Go ye, saith Christ, in *St. Matthew*, and teach all Nations, baptizing them in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, which plainly distinguishes three Persons. And, Take heed (saith *St. Paul* in the *Acts*) therefore unto your selves, and to all the Flock, over which the Holy Ghost hath made you Overseers, to feed the Church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood. Here we have two persons distinct, expressed, *The Holy Ghost*, whose act of making Overseers doth infer an Agent, and that Agent a Person. And in that it is said, *God purchased the Church with his blood*, there is an express Character of Christ in his Passion, to whom is expressly given the title of God, for that God the Father died, nor Christ as God, though Christ, God, is manifest: Now of God the Father no Christian can make doubt, after so many manifest Texts expressing the same. And *Rom.* 9. v. 5. *Whose are the Fathers, and of whom concerning the flesh Christ came, who is over all, God blessed for ever.* The Scholie of *Socinus* and his followers being meerly cavillous, and forced contrary to common reading. The Confession likewise of *Thomas* upon the Miracle wrought by Christ, proveth the Deity of Christ, crying out, *My God and my Lord.* And in the Epistle to the *Colossians*, the God-head is said to dwell in Christ bodily, i.e. in opposition to figuratively or improperly. To these bare Testimonies add we these rational proofs from the Attributes proper to God, given to Christ: 1. Eternity, *Micah* 5. 2. *His goings-out are from everlasting.* 2. Omnipotence, *Joh.* 3. 31. *He that cometh from above is above all; but only God is above all.* An instance likewise of Christs Omnipotency is given us by *St. Paul* to the *Philippians*,

Rom. 9. 5.

Joh. 20. v. 28.  
Col. 2. 9.Micah.  
Joh. 3. 31.

*Philippians*, where speaking of Christ, he saith, *Who shall change our vile body, that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious body, according to the working whereby he is able to subdue all things unto himself.* 3. Immensity, another property of God, is given to Christ, *Mat. 18.20.* Where he promisseth, *Where two or three shall be gathered together in his Name, he will be in the midst of them;* which is not possible for him that is not God, Christ's Church being in all places diffused. 4. Divine worship given to Christ implies a divine nature in him, but both Old and New Testaments agree herein, that Christ the Messiah is to be worshipped. In the *Psalms* thus it is written of him, *Yea all Kings shall fall down before him, and all Nations shall worship him.* And in the second *Psalms*, *David* adviseth to *kiss the Son,* (that is) worship him, *lest he be angry, and ye perish from the right way; when his wrath is kindled but a little, blessed are all they that put their trust in him.* Now we know the same *Psalmist* saith, *Put not your trust in Princes, nor in any Son of man, in whom there is no help.* And believing in Christ is a special part of worship; but this is required by Christ of his Disciples, saying, *Ye believe in God, believe also in me.* Prayer likewise is made to Christ by *St. Stephen*; for in the *Acts* it is written how *Stephen* was stoned, calling upon Christ and saying, *Lord Jesus receive my spirit.*

Phil.3.21.

Psal.72.

Psal.2.

Psal.146.3.

Joh.14.12.

Acts.7.

The third Person in the holy Trinity is the holy Ghost, which we have shewed in part, that the learnedest of the ancient Jews were not ignorant of, though more obscurely delivered in the Old Testament than in the New. The first thing then we are to prove is, That the holy Ghost is a Person; for that it is, there needs no other proof than the words themselves so often used in Scripture: And that it subsists personally, and not only as an Act or Grace, will appear from these two general heads, The Acts of it, and the Attributes given to it. And first, In what sense the Scriptures use evil Spirit, in the same sense may it be said to use the good Spirit; but evil Spirit is frequently used for a Person, who is the author of mischief to mankind, and therefore the good Spirit must be a Person, the author of good to man. We read in Scripture of a *Spirit of error*, and the *Spirit of slumber*, and the *Spirit of disobedience*, and of an *evil Spirit* that possessed *Saul*, and of a *lying Spirit* that entred into, and moved the false Prophets; and in the New Testament as well as humane Authors, of divers who have been infested with evil Spirits. Now all these were real and personal Substances, and therefore in parity of reason so shou'd the good Spirit, of which we so often read both in the Old and New Testament, under the appellation of the Spirit of the Lord; as the Spirit of the Lord moved upon the waters at the beginning, and the Spirit of the Lord fell upon such persons. And if it be here replied, That we are to understand the good Spirits after the same manner we understand the evil; and that the evil Spirits being evil Angels, the good Spirit should be good Angels only: We answer, not denying, That Spirit may be so used in Scripture divers times; and that by the same parity of reason that it is insinuated unto us, that the evil Spirit hath one Prince and chief amongst them called *Lucifer*, so the good Spirits have one supreme over them, that good Spirit of God. Secondly, That where Scripture speaks of Spirit absolutely, there the divine Spirit is constantly to be understood, as *St. Hierome* hath observed:

1 Joh.4.6.  
Rom.11.8.  
Eph.2.2.  
1 Sam.16. 14.  
2 Chron.18.  
20.21.

Again, We read from the Acts of the Spirit as interceding for us, being grieved; and descending upon Christ in a bodily shape at his Baptism; and Christ's speech to his Disciples, saying in *St. John*, *I will ask the Father,*

Rom.8.26.  
Eph.4.30.  
Mat.3.16.

ther,



ther, and he shall give you another Comforter. Christ was the one Comforter, not only by his Graces, but personal presence among his Disciples; and answerable to this, must the holy Spirit be also, here promised.

And that this divine Person is distinct from the other, appeareth from the general Doctrine of the Trinity above, and specially out of St. Matthew, where Christ saith, ——— *Baptizing them in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the holy Ghost*; which must imply a distinction. And St. John, Chap. 1. *He that sent me to baptize with water, the same said unto me, Upon whom thou shalt see the Spirit descending and remaining on him, the same is he which baptizeth with the holy Ghost.* And so Job. 14. 16. Job. 15. 26.

From the same place of St. Matthew appeareth the equality of all these three Persons; and especially from the immediate operation the Spirit had upon Christ, who was God and Man; for of it, Isaiah thus prophesieth, *The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, for that he hath annointed me to, &c.* which Christ himself applied to himself.

Secondly, The Attributes of the same Spirit infer a Deity, as Omniscience, 1 Cor. 2. *The Spirit searcheth all things, yea the deep things of God.* And lest this should be understood of a search without success or full knowledge, it followeth, *For what man knoweth the things of man, save the spirit of a man which is in him? Even so the things of God knoweth no man but the Spirit of God.* Creation: *The Spirit of God hath made me, and the breath of the Almighty hath given me life,* saith holy Job. And Christ casting out Devils by the Spirit of God; and the Apostles miraculous acts, demonstrating the Spirit of God in them; the preaching of St. Paul being in the demonstration of the Spirit and of power, i. e. being so powerful in outward acts and miracles, that it was sufficient conviction that he spake and wrought by the Spirit; but miracles cannot be wrought by any thing less than a divine Power. And by St. Peter it is called, *The Spirit of Glory and of God.* By St. Paul it is called God himself, where he saith, *Know ye not that ye are the Temple of God, and that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you? If any man defile the Temple of God, him shall God destroy; for the Temple of God is holy, which Temple are ye.* Here we plainly see, how the Temple of God and the Temple of the holy Ghost, are the same thing.

And thus we see confirm'd, what St. John very plainly and positively asserteth of this Mystery, That *there are three that bear record in Heaven, the Father, the Word, and the holy Ghost, and these three are one.* And this may suffice to have spoken (according to our purpose) compendiously, as well of the Unity as Trinity of these Persons in the God-head; only adding, without any long or curious enquiry, the several *Notions* and *Idioms*, whereby they are distinct in our Faith. The Property of the first Person is to be the Fountain, and after the manner of first Principle of the other, to whom therefore some ascribe a dignity of order, above the other two, though not of time or duration, being all co-eternal, and the one not to be conceived anterior to the other: Nor of Nature, as if the divine Nature were unequally communicated to them, but that they are co-equal in Being and in Power, or Acting externally. Another Property of the first Person is to be a Father in respect of the Son, the second Person; and together with the Son, to bear such a relation to the third, the holy Spirit, for which no proper name hath been yet found out, and whether it be possible to express the same aptly in one word, I much question. It is

is commonly called *Proceſſion*, on the part of the holy-Ghoſt; and in general, on the parts of the other two Perſons; *Production*, which yet is limited to the excluding of ſuch a Production as answers Generation, and much more of Creation, beſides which, natural Reaſon can comprehend no other: But Chriſtian Faith obliges us to contain our ſelves modeſtly in the general Notion of *Proceeding*. Some have indeed preſumed to diſtinguiſh the production of the Son by the Father, from the production of the holy Ghoſt by the Father and the Son, in that the Son proceeds from the Father *Intellectually*, as a word is conceived in the mind; but the holy Spirit as act of the joynt will of Father and Son, by way of Love: Of which explication I ſhall ſuſpend all ſentence, leaving others to judge.

### CHAP. V.

*Of the proper Acts of God, Creation and Preſervation, or Providence. What is Creation. That God created all things, and him. Of the Miniſters of Gods Providence towards inferior Creatures, the Angels of God. Their Nature and Office towards Man eſpecially.*

**T**HAT God is the proper Object of Chriſtian Faith or Divinity, not only as principal, but as all other things therein treated, relate to him, is before ſhewed. Now therefore we proceed from the Creator to the Creature, to which the two hands of God are more viſibly and eminently extended or ſtretched out: The firſt, In the *Creation* it ſelf; The other, In the *Providence* of God over the works of his hands, as the Scriptures phraſe is. And firſt, Of *Creation*; we underſtanding it to be after the nature of an Act, muſt find out the proper *term* or *object* of it, which is contained in that received definition thereof: *Creation is the production of a thing out of nothing*; or more plainly, *a making ſomething of nothing*. In which we are not ſo groſſly to conceive of Gods Act, as if he made the world ſo of nothing, as a man makes a Statue of ſomething; but *of nothing*, or *out of nothing*, is as much as *from nothing*, or nothing concurring by way of pre-exiſtent matter, to produce ſuch an effect: For if any thing had been, which had not its firſt Being from the firſt Cauſe of all, God, that muſt have been God alſo, or there could not be ſaid to have been any God at all, becauſe there could be no order, where was no *firſt* and *ſecond*; and where matter is ſuppoſed to have been eternal, there no priority of time can be admitted: So that either ſuch thing muſt have been God, as we have ſeen in the Relations in the Trinity, or no God at all; becauſe that is not God, to which an equal in any reſpect, diſtinct in nature from him, may be found; for Gods Nature is to be above all.

Neither can any reaſon be poſſibly alledged, whereby it ſhould appear,  
 LI that,

Ἐν γὰρ οὐκ  
ἔστι τῆς ὕλης  
ἀντίθετος ἡ  
ἀλλ' ἐξ ὧν οὐ-  
κέναντες ὕλη  
ποιῶν τὰ ὄντα  
ἀδύνατος ἐστὶ  
σκεῖσθαι.  
Athanasius  
de Incarnat.

that, if simple matter (as some call it) might have subsisted, before it was made simply by God, the Sun and Moon, and other compound bodies in Nature, might not have pre-existed and prevented Gods workmanship; or why an imperfect Being should have the dignity denied to a more perfect, but at the pleasure and will of the supreme Agent disposing all things? For that which was not at all produced by another, must necessarily spring out of nothing, or of it self: And why might not a Man, or Horse, or any other thing do so, as well as infamous Matter?

Furthermore, Unless there were a productive Power in God, of something out of nothing, the Power of God would not answer the Nature of God. The Nature of God is infinite, so therefore must his Power be; but the Power of God could not be known to be infinite, if such an infinite effect were not producible by him.

Lastly, This denial of Gods Power to produce even the first imaginable matter, would also destroy his Power in creating any thing not consisting of such matter; and so should the production of Spirits utterly be denied him, as having no pre-existent matter; out of which they can be said to be fram'd.

It must be confessed, the word *Create* and *Creation* in Scripture, is not so strictly used as in Philosophers Books, but imports any notable production, as well as that simple one without pre-existence: Yet the thing it self is affirmed; as where it is said, *All things were made by God*; for there nothing is excepted or exempted from his Power; as *Heb. 11. Through faith we understand that the worlds were framed by the Word of God, so that things which are seen, were not made of things which do appear*; and he only can preserve all things, who maketh all things: But God in Christ, or Christ through God upholdeth all things by the word of his Power. And in the *Revelations* it is said, *Thou hast created all things, and for thy pleasure they were and are created*. And in the tenth Chapter, the Angel swear-eth by him that liveth for ever and ever, *who created Heaven, and the things that are therein; and the Earth, and the things that therein are, and the Sea, and the things that are therein*. And aptly do the words of the *Psalmist* answer the History of the Creation, who speaking of the particulars of this natural world, saith of God, *He commanded, and they were created*; this being the only means and method, that we read all things to have been produced, *viz.* the word of his Power, *Let there be Light, Let there be the Firmament, &c.* which 'being a demonstration of his immediate will, most wisely implieth (as some eminent Philosophers have with great admiration observed) the proper Power of God Almighty, to whom nothing is difficult that he willeth should come to pass. Now where there is no limitation upon an agent, but what proceeds from its own will, there nothing is impossible, and if it be possible for God to will (as must be, seeing man may desire) to produce somewhat from nothing, it must be possible to come to pass what so is willed by him; otherwise God should be disappointed and frustrated in his intentions, than which nothing can be thought more absurd, or repugnant to the Nature of God.

And thus at the same time it appears, as well what God made, as how, *viz.* That there is nothing extant, whether visible or invisible, but what was framed by him, and that absolutely, as the Apostle more expressly testifieth to the *Colossians*, *By him were all things created that are in heaven and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities or powers, all things were created by him, and for him*. By which we under-

stand,

Heb. 11. 13.

Heb. 1. 3.  
Rev. 4. 11.

Chap. 10. 6.

Psal. 148. 5.

Col. 1. 16



stand, that all the Angels and several orders of those invisible Spirits in Heaven, were the effect of his Power, no less than were inferior and visible Creatures. And though there be no particular mention of the time, order, place, or manner of the Creation of Angels, yet that they were so created, general assurance we have from the Word of God; the holy Ghost advisedly omitting (and mens wits only conjecturing at the) other things, to prevent pride and curiosity in man, to whom it was sufficient to make a description of those things, which related to this visible world, and concerned him to know: So that the Heavens themselves, with the glorious and numerous Lights thereof, are no farther explained unto us, than as their influences concern the nature and actions of Man. It is a true Axiom, that all things were made for man, but it is not true, that they had no other end why God created them, namely, Heavens, heavenly Bodies, and heavenly Spirits, but for to serve the uses of man, next to the ultimate end of all, his own Glory. For though it be said of Angels, (and we take the word in the properest sense, and not as it may be for the several Messengers and Dispensers of Gods will and Word, to the several Ages of men) *Are they not all ministering Spirits, sent forth to them who shall be heirs of salvation?* Yet we look on their attendance in such cases, as an honorary command and tuition over us, and secondary end to their first Institution, rather than any thing of subjection or servility. For when the Shepherd looks to his Flock, and when the King is said to be for the People, we are not in reason or sobriety to imagine a worth in the governed above the governour, as some have fondly, wretchedly, and dangerously concluded: For that Rule, *The end is more excellent than the means, or thing ordained to that end*, holds true only, when the thing is so ordain'd, that its own end and good is not equally, or more eminently included in the same; or when the end is the principal agent in instituting such a thing to such an end. But the Sheep never appointed the Shepherd to serve, to rule, and protect them, nor did men oblige Angels to wait upon them; nor, as is above demonstrated, the People first erect, or constitute Governors or Governments over themselves, these were done by a superior Power over them; neither at this day can they, that is, ought, by any imaginary Charter alter the Archetype of Gods Institution. And they that do attempt, and have pretended to confer Power sometimes on Governors, can at all do it directly and validly: But they seem and are interpreted by many so to do, when they unwarrantably and unreasonably deny it to others, and submit to their own favourites; though how lamely and improperly these acts of strength, and not of right, are carried on, is also elsewhere shewed. For no question, but if the common sort of men could extend their presumptuous Power to Spirits, as they do to Princes, they would take such offence against their tutelary Angels, as to put them out of office, when they find themselves crossed in their inclinations or designs by them, or persuading themselves they are neglected by them, choosing others in their places, and justify such their acts from a dignity supposed in themselves, from being the end of their care and ministration. If indeed we appointed Spirits or Princes over us, as men do choose servants to do their work for them, and serve them, then surely we might as justly turn them off again, when ever they became unserviceable and prejudicial to us; but seeing both are appointed by God, we are to know our distance, notwithstanding the good offices they do for us: And that considering, secondly, That their own ends are no less principally and primarily served in such ministrations, than the ends of others.

Heb. i. 14.

Τὰ κληροῖ  
 οὐ καὶ ταῦτα  
 καὶ τὰ ἐν τῷ  
 Δαυὶδ καὶ τῷ  
 ὑπὸ τοῦ κυρίου  
 λεχθέντα, τί-  
 νας μὲ τῶν  
 Ἀγγέλων  
 ἰθὺν περὶ  
 τὰς τίνας  
 ὅτι ἐν ὅ  
 τῶν ἀνθρώπων  
 πνεύματι τὴν  
 ἐπιμέλειαν,  
 ὅτι οὐκ οὐκ  
 αὐτοὶ ὅτι  
 μαίνας τὴν  
 ἀλάστορας  
 δαίμονας.  
 Theodoretus  
 Heret. Fa-  
 bular. lib. 5.  
 cap. 7.

Hieron. in c. 3  
Habbac.

Calvin in Act.  
15 & Pfal. 96.  
& Mat. 18. 10.

And yet I make no doubt, but many persons to whom God hath given holy and righteous Spirits to protect and preserve them, being ungoverned and refractory, lewd and licentious, contrary to the mind and motions of them presiding over them, do in effect dismiss them, the holy Guardian refusing such an unprofitable and servile office, and at the same time in effect invite evil Spirits to joyn with them in their dissolute courses, and to manage them therein. To the confirmation of which, I shall only translate the words of St. Hierom upon Habbacuck: *As Christ is the Head of his Church and every man, so is Belzebub the Prince of Devils, the head of all such Devils as rage in this world, and every company of them hath their Heads and Princes. For example, Spirits of Fornication and Uncleaness have their Head; the Spirits of Covetousness have their Prince; the Spirits of Vain-glory; the Spirits of Lying, the Spirits of Infidelity have their Presidents of mischief.* This I say, supposing the great opinion which asserteth the Ministrati- on of good and evil Angels, as is here intimated from the grounds given in Scripture, and such a cloud of ancient and modern witnesses, against whom it pleased Calvin to interpret Scripture in this point, with addition of scoffs and derisions, which I here leave to them that like them well, and proceed to this visible and inferior World.

## CHAP. VI.

*Of the Works of God in this visible World.  
Of the Six days Work of God. All things  
are good which were made by God.*

Gen. i. 1.

**I**T is plainly affirmed in the entrance of the History of the Creation, that, *In the beginning God created the Heavens and the Earth.* By which two general Bodies, we understand all particular, reducible to either of them; and that there is nothing so pure, perfect, or noble, above which we call heavenly Bodies, but God first gave it a Being; neither is there any earthly Substance so imperfect, base, or impure, but his hand descended to the framing of it: For first, Nothing is absolutely evil, but only as there are some more excellent and divine things made by God, which eclipse their glory, which otherwise would be seen and noted in the most vile thing of all. And secondly, Nothing is so base, but that an infinite Power is requisite to the first production of it; neither did the divine hand labour more in producing an Angel, than the first deformed Matter, out of which other things were made. So that the error of such Hereticks as the *Marcionites* and *Manichees*, who constituted two Gods, from the diversity of things appearing to them, good and evil, was no less sottish than blasphemous, and derogatory to Almighty Gods Nature and Providence. For as the Scripture tells us, after a particular view made by God of every days work, he pronounced all things to be good; so at the

the consummation of all things, he passeth this sentence upon all his works together, *And God saw every thing that he had made, and behold it was very good.*

Gen. 1.31.

And to the general Objection against this, taken from the contrariety and enormities one thing hath to another in the world, and especially the great evil that many things bring unto man, for whose good they seem principally to be intended, such as are ravenous wild Beasts, venomous Serpents, and deadly poysons lurking in Plants: The answer is ready and fair, *viz.* That God made not any thing absolutely for anothers, no not for mans good, but for his own Glory, and the manifestation of his Power, Wisdom and Goodness, to all. And therefore, though by nature some things are repugnant to one another, nothing is contrary unto God: all the contrariety to God found in the Creature, is meerly accessory, and not natural, and that only in such Creatures as were at first endued with so much freedom of will, that they might persevere in that natural perfection given them, or fall from it. Again, After the chief of Gods ways, as the principal order of Angels and Man, were degenerated into evil, the Universe continued notwithstanding, perfect, and God provided for the evil it self crept into it. For as in a Dispensatory, all things are not sweet, but some sharp and bitter; all things are not lenitives, but some corrosive and cutting, and there are poysons and counter-poysons: So is it in this great World; God hath disposed every thing in its proper place, and to its proper end, and one contrary to counterwork another; to the benefit of the whole, and constituting of all, a most excellent harmony. As in a well-tuned Lute or Harp, the strings stand many times of themselves in discord, but being toucht by the skilful hand of the Artist, do render to the ear excellent harmony: In like manner, the discord of the Elements, and other compounded Bodies, being most wisely ordained and moved by the hand of the all-ruling Providence, do make an excellent consort, to the praise and glory of God. Lastly, As it is no less necessary, to the preserving of the common peace and tranquillity of a Nation, that there should be Prisons as well as Palaces, and whips and halters, as well as honours and riches: So is it in the world, the Commonwealth over which God alone presides, necessary, that for the deterring of evilly-inclined persons, for the repressing of seditiously and rebelliously-disposed persons, and malefactors against God their Sovereign, there should alwayes be at hand, Gods Instruments to chastise and punish them; and this is done, by commissioning and arming the Creature to seize upon them, by afflicting the body, or estate of the contumacious, or meliorating them to an higher degree of perfection: So that though some things to man in some one capacity, may be found to be evil, yet is it not in all respects, and in it self, not at all. And thus is resolved, as well the evil aspects and influences of the Heavens, as the violences of inferior bodies against man, nay, the reason of Hell it self, as *Chrysostome* saith.

For that the Heavens are the work of Gods hands, hath been shewed before in the general Discourse, and may yet farther, from the Authority of the Psalmist, which saith of God, *He hath set his Glory above the Heavens.* And, *The Heavens are the work of thy fingers, the Moon and the Stars which thou hast ordained.* And, *The Heavens declare the Glory of God, and the Firmament sheweth his handy-work.*

*Vide Petrum Comestorem in Genesim. 'Ου διὰ χρεῖαν μόνον ἀπάντα παρήγαγεν ἀλλὰ διὰ δόξαν.* Chrysost. in Gen. Ser. 7.

Τελεία γὰρ λόγῳ καὶ δημιουργίᾳ καὶ μόνον διάφορα ποιεῖν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀλλήλοις ἐναντία· οἱ τὰ λευκὰ καὶ μακρὰ καὶ στερεὰ, καὶ ὑγρὰ καὶ ἀσθενή καὶ θνήσκειν. Aeneas Gazæus in Theophrasto.

Καὶ πάλιν· ὅτι ἐν τῷ αἰθέρι διὰ τὸ καὶ ἐλπίσιν, καὶ ἐν τῇ γῇ καὶ ἐν τῇ θαλάσσῃ καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἀστέροις καὶ ἐν τοῖς ὕδατι καὶ ἐν τοῖς ζώοντι· αὐτὸν δὲ τὸ ἐκτελεῖν. Chrysost. To. 6. Ser. 102. p. 895. Psal. 8. 1. 3. Psal. 19. 1.



Psal. 8. 3.

1. That God therefore made the Heavens, and all the Hosts thereof, is most plain, and as most plain, so most necessary to be believed; but concerning the nature and number of them, it is rather a Philosophical curiosity, than Christian duty, to enquire. And that little which we may draw from Scripture, hath more of reason in it, than all the presumptuous imaginations of men; for such I call their defining them to be solid, orbicular bodies, moving like wheels about the earth, and consisting of eight Sphears, with a *Primum Mobile*, or First Mover; and an Empyrean Heaven, and a special Court, as it were, where God sets more especially enthron'd, arch'd over with the roof of another Heaven; for all which there is no more solid reason than Scripture to be found, though some for want of soberness and better proofs (as the Jewish Rabbi) have presumed to determine the number of the Sphears, from the expression in the eighth Psalm, where it is said, *The Heavens are the work of thy fingers*; ten fingers, ten Heavens; but the Scriptures speak of no more than three, 2 Cor. 12. 2. And that they are rather to be understood, as so many Regions distinguishable in the air, than such superior bodies, appears from the synonymous use of the Fowls of the air, and the Fowls of Heaven, as in Psal. 79. 2. and Psal. 104. 12. Jer. 7. 33. Ezek. 31. 6. Gen. 1. 26, 28.

2 Chron. 2. 6.

Yet as no man can, out of Philosophy or Scripture, determine the nature or number of Heavens, is it not to be peremptorily denied, that there are distinctions of places of Bliss? And though it be little otherwise than blasphemous to confine God to the highest, largest, fairest room, called an Heaven, as that there should be any limits set to his Court or Throne of Glory, yet may we well believe God is somewhere more gloriously revealed, than commonly he is in all places, though he be in all places: and where he displays his Glory, and beatifies his more immediate servants, there is Heaven; as we say, There is the Court, where the King is.

It is true, we gather reasonably from the position and motion of celestial Lights, a distinction in distance and motion of them, and that a peculiar tract there is for most of them; but that this space should be roof'd over round with a pellucide, solid, ætherial substance, is an absurd collection of Philosophers, no ways favoured by Scripture, which, as it hath touched things of this nature with greater simplicity, so with much more probability; inviting us rather to an admiration of the divine Power, and adoration of its Providence, in ordaining so admirably those bodies, as for his Glory, so for our instruction and edification in his service. The same reason doubtless there is of Time and Place, as well in respect of the Creator as the Creature: It is impossible but the Creature should be limitable by time and space both, and it is impossible God should by either be so; and therefore no less derogatory to his Being is it, to imagine God terminated by space, than by time.

The other part of this visible World, is that which we call Earth, with the several bodies pertaining unto the same, as Water, Fire and Air; all which, though of very different nature or use to us, are properly earthly. The solid part and grosser, which we signally call *Earth*, and that liquid, fluid and purer substance, we call *Water*, being the two most principal parts and elements out of which all things here proceed: *Fire* and *Air* being no distinct bodies of themselves, but subsisting upon their grounds; and especially, *Air* being nothing else, but a purer composition of the substance of Earth and Water flying about the earth, and ministring continuall refreshment to all earthly, living things.

Fire

Fire indeed is of a wonderful subtil nature, and operation most active, but whether any thing in substance, distinct from the other, and not only in quality, is scarce to be understood. And though Philosophy busies it self to the losing of its way, in the search after these things, and presumes to determine and impose upon others its uncertain Conclusions; yet the modesty of Religion contents it self to keep a mannerly distance, where God, by the Mysteries of Nature, and much more of Theology, seems to say, *Stand off*; which we shall, contenting our selves at present, with that brief narration of the manner and order of the Creation of all things, found in the first Chapter of *Genesis*: where we note, the way of Gods working to be most like himself, without any pains or trouble, but by the simple and absolute word of his command given, *Let there be Light*.

It is said indeed, that God in six days made all things in Heaven and Earth, as if the Creation took him up both time and pains to compleat it; whence some fearing to make the matter too gross on Gods part, have (as *Austin*) introduced an *Evening* and *Morning*, relating rather to the Angels, than Men, making that the Morning, when those holy Spirits beheld things to be Created in the divine Nature and Vision; and that Vespertine, when they were actually seen in themselves existing; which interpretation hath not been received in the Church as solid: But rather this Morning and Evening, which could not be natural until the Sun was created, (which it was not at the first) is understood of a competent distance of time, which it might please God, not out of necessity, but free choice, to work in, to declare his order, and give us a more distinct knowledge of things, and especially to prevent that error to which man was too inclinable, in conceiving all things were eternal, which we now see. For if they were so, then could there be no distinction or distance of time between one thing and another; but where there is such a diversity of time, there of necessity must be posteriority and priority, and so no eternity.

For that which some bring out of *Ecclesiasticus*, to prove the production of all things in one moment, viz. *He that liveth for ever, created all things together*, is a mistake in the Latin Translation only, which renders *omni* in the Greek so, which is better translated as we do, *In general*; intimating, that nothing subsisted but by him. Or it may be said, *All things were created together*, or at once, meaning, that what God did produce, he did it not after the manner of men; who bring their work to perfection by degrees and many acts, but every thing that was made by him, was made at once in an instant.

And this general consideration of the six dayes Work of God, may suffice here, not descending to each, particularly; only we shall speak of the Creation of Man in particular, as the chief of Gods wayes, and the Rule and end of other Creatures.

## C H A P. VII.

*Of the Creation of Man in particular, according to the Image of God. Of the Constitution of him, and of the Original of his Soul, contrary to Philosophers, and the errors of Origen, concerning it. The Image wherein it consists principally.*

Gen. 2. 7.

1 Cor. 15. 47.

**C**REATION (we have shewed) is the production of a thing from nothing, and so the first man was not created immediately; for it is said, *God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life.* And St. Paul likewise to the *Corinthians*, saith, *The first man was of the earth, earthy.* And the like may be said of other Creatures, which yet together with man may be said to be created, because they were produced of that which was immediately created by God, the first matter: Where likewise we are not to understand the word *Earth* so strictly, as not to imply water also, for the word *Earth* doth comprehend all things of, and pertaining to this Globe, called *Earthly*, from the principal part of it, *Earth*.

Gen. 2. 22, 23.

And as *Adam* was made out of the *Earth* immediately, we read *Eve* to be made immediately out of *Adam*, God causing a deep sleep upon *Adam*, and then taking one of his ribs, and closing up the flesh instead thereof, of which rib he made the woman. And there is no such difficulty as Scholastical wits would frame, when from hence they would infer, That, if God took one rib from *Adam*, he had either more at first than were natural to man, or fewer afterward, and so must have something of monstrousness; a strange argument to perswade such a man as *Cajetan*, That God did not this really, but that the Scripture here speaks Metaphorically, when as this is a direct History which is given us here of the Creation. For suppose we that God had made man at first otherwise than now he is by himself altered, might it not be well said, that both the one and the other were natural to him? It is impossible that God should do any thing monstrous, or unnatural, through an whole species: and therefore no scruple ought to be made of allowing God, who is the Nature of Nature, to dispose his works as he pleases, and change nature; so that if it should seem good to him now to take away one of mans legs, and cause him generally to go upon one only, this would be no more monstrous than his going now upon two is.

And in like manner, is it very frivolous, that is given as a reason by the Schools, of Gods causing such a deep sleep upon *Adam*, lest he should be sensible of too much pain, at that act of taking out his Rib; when as the same miracle that cast him into a sleep, and preserved him from waking, under such supposed pain, might as well have preserved him from pain, waking, as sleeping. It may be rather to teach us, that he would not have us privy to his mysterious acts, nor pry too nearly into them. And therefore a reason is given by *Chrysostome* both acutely and soberly, why God first made

Chrysost. de  
Fide, Legē,  
Naturā, &c. S. S.



made *Adams* Body before he created his Soul, or breath'd into him the breath of Life: *Least he should see how himself was made*, which might be a reason, why at the framing of *Eve* he was cast into a sleep, which is the very reason the same Author, or, as it is thought, some other under his name, doth give in another place: whose words, because I judge to deliver the manner of mans Creation more aptly, plainly, and sincerely than the Schools, (who are very busie and curious here) I shall thus translate. God (saith he) first framing Man, made the Instrument of his Body, and then put into it the Soul. Why so? To the end he might thereby declare the Excellency of Man. For seeing, other Animals, and Beasts being dissolved by death their soul and Body perish together, he speaks of the production of them, as of those things which were to perish absolutely. God therefore, about to fashion man, takes his Body out of the earth, and then breaths in his Soul. Stay but a little, that I may shew to you the manner of this breathing into man, so far as I am able. For from what went before, and from hence he describeth, as it were, the hope of Resurrection. He makes the Body first: and Man first received a dead Image, and then the quickening vertue of the soul. He was first shewn dead, then living. First he made a dead Body, into which he was again to return: and thus when he had finished that, he added the Character or form: and did not make his soul first, that he might not be a Spectatour of what was made. He would not suffer the soul to be present when he made man, lest it should glory as an assistant to God in that work: and not only that it might not boast, but might not so much as behold the manner how it was done. And thus doth God still. For he frameth every one of us in the womb: But how he so frameth us, he hath granted no man to see. We are sown, and we are fashioned, nature perfecting the course, but the manner no man comprehends. O, the wonder! A Temple is made in a Temple; an House in an House is framed: and the outward house perceives it not. First then, he makes man according to a dead Image: and then he saith, God breathed into the face of Adam the breath of Life, and man became a living soul. Some have been of opinion that this Breath was his very soul: and that it was given him of the very Essence of God: But that saying is not only very mild, but absurd also. For if the soul were the very substance of God; it could not be, that in this man it should be wise, in another it should be foolish, and ignorant; and in this man a just soul, in that man an unjust. For the Essence of God is neither divided nor changed, but immutable — Nay, not only are the souls of men mutable, but liable to condemnation. For so saith the Gospel, Fear not them that can kill the body, but cannot kill the soul, but fear ye him rather who is able to destroy both body and soul in hell. If therefore the soul be of God, then should God condemn himself. Therefore it is necessary we should see what this is. The Breathing. This breathing is the Power of the Holy Spirit. For as our Saviour breath'd on the faces of his Apostles, and said, Receive ye the Holy Ghost: so this divine breath heard after the manner of men, is that Venerable and Holy Spirit. And this Holy Spirit too present, was not the soul it self, but made the soul: it was not it self changed into the Soul, but framed it. For the Ho'y Spirit was the Author: it was concerned in the making both of the body and Soul. For the Father, and the Son, and the Ho'y Ghost made this work: And do not imagin that the Father contributed one part, the Son another, and the Holy Ghost a third. But this I say, that though the Father made it, it is the work of the Son, and the Fabrick of the Holy Spirit. &c. Thus far that Elegant and Learned Author: However some inconsiderable difference is found amongst ancient and Modern Doctours, some saying that

Ἰνα μὴ βλῇ  
αὐτὸν τὴν ψυ-  
χὴν αὐτοῦ.  
Chrysost. To. 3.  
pag. 649.

Mat. io. 28.

Joh. 20. 22.

the Angels were created: but when that was, there is nothing besides conjecture, only they say, upon such a supposal, that it affords a good argument against the opinion that holds the Soul of man to be *educated* out of the matter of the Body, as are Brutes Souls. But that is not here nor there: because certain it is that the way of producing the Soul at first differ'd much from what it doth in the course of Natural generation. For then were there no natural Causes concurring with God in the production of the Soul, but now there are; God now not so absolutely creating humane souls, but that there should be some pre-disposing and preparatory acts on mans part conducing thereunto: For it seemeth not to be inconsistent with proper Creation, that such Acts are required thereunto, so that the Soul of man is never now created, but by them preceding (according to the order of Nature, though not of time, because in so concurring, the Natural Agent doth not concur with God in the very act of Creating, but to the occasion rather, which God hath by a Law made freely to himself decreed to work by in this matter: But at the first of all God purely made the occasion it self, and simply and solely acted of himself.

There are therefore these three errors to be avoided in the doctrine of the Soul: The first is that of Epicures and Infidels, that the Soul of man was no otherwise produced than the souls of Brutes: but that they are in Substance the same with brutes, differing only from them in the finer temperament of the body; and the nobler aspect which it informeth. But this cannot stand good: because, though we grant that the evil disposition of the humors of the Body, and incommodious frame of the Parts thereof, may impede the due exercise of such Acts which are proper to that Kind, yet such perfection cannot at all give ability to act so: and therefore another Principle must be found out, whose nature it is so to act; and to which such things are only Organical and subservient. For, it being acknowledged that the Soul is of an Active, and more noble nature than the Body, as Spirit is than flesh; it cannot be imagined that the Soul should follow the fashion or nature of the Body, but that the matter or the Body should be accommodated and suited to the nature of the soul: as no man can say, that the hand should be fitted to the Instrument by which it works, but the Instrument to the Hand: And no man can with reason affirm that an house being to be built, the Inhabitant or owner is to be brought to that; but that surely is to be modelled and framed according to the mind and Rank of the Owner: So no reason is there to suppose the body should give Law to the soul, in the nature (I mean) of it, and its actions: though it may have some force upon the manner of its actions: As the Hand makes the Pen to write, and not the Pen the hand, absolutely: but a good and well-made Pen may be an occasion to the Hand to write well or ill. And therefore it is not the body of Brutes which makes the Soul brutish, nor the Body of man which makes the Soul humane: but on the contrary so, that as their natures are different, should their original likewise differ; And this difference cannot be taken from the matter, because the diversity of the matter ariseth from the Form. And besides, the Scripture telling us that God breathed into man the breath of Life, declareth withal that the Soul of man (as the Philosopher himself speaks) came *from without doors* and not *from within*. But this is said of no other Creature.

A Second mortal Error is that imputed to *Origen*, viz. That Human souls were created, but not singly and separately, according to the conception of particular persons, but all at once, and that together with the Angels.

Angels. That the Angels ; as all other things (God excepted) were created, is to be received as an Article of Faith, but there is neither any thing revealed unto us by the Scripture or discovered by reason when they were so created : How then can any man positively say, that the souls of men were then created? this being then a groundless supposition, light and vain must needs be the inference from thence. Nay, not only is the Scripture silent in that Case ; but expresses on the contrary the time when the Soul of man was made and that it was at his first Constitution according to the order of the Historie, which first describes the manner how Man was made, and then adds, how God not put the soul into it which he had before made, but breathed into it the breath of Life . So that as the breath, is not at all until it be actually breathed, no more was the Soul before it was thus infused by way of breathing. Again, the absolute ignorance of the Soul of any such pre-existence : which it is not possible, if we may suppose it in one or two, that all Souls should be subject to. And I call this ignorance and stupidity rather than oblivion, as some Philosophers the Authors of this opinion would have it. For though a man may forget what he did at such a time, and that once he was in such a place ; and such, and such things befall him : yet who did ever forget that he had a Being ? A man may through the strong invasion of some sickness or distemper, cease to understand any thing, as also in a profound sleep : yet he is not properly said to forget these. Some have forgot their own names, but never any that they were simply. And therefore some ancient defenders of this opinion seeing the incredibleness of this Forgetfulness, have with infinite impudence introduced persons professing they remembered what they were, and did some hundreds of years before they were in those bodies they spake of these things in. Lastly, How is it credible that that soul which is the fountain of Life, Sense, and Knowledge to the person where it is, should so inform a thing distinct from it self, and yet be ignorant of it self? Surely it must be because there was nothing to be known of it before it inhabited the Body.

A Third Error depending upon this last, is that of *Origen* likewise, who affirmed that Souls being Spirits before they were committed to the body, were put into them as to so many prisons for their former disobedience and wickedness, for their punishment. But against this (amongst other reasons) *Isidore* of *Belusium* argueth well, thus, *How vain and absurd would it be to suppose Providence to Chastise any sinful person or Spirit, by offering greater and more occasions of Sinning than before ?* Prisons are made chiefly for restraint : but the body of man rather disposeth the soul to sin, and ministreth many more occasions and temptations than it could have before, to dishonour God and break his Laws. Again, as *Parisensis* hath it, *That cannot be said to be a punishment to man of which he is no wayes sensible.* How can any man be said to be afflicted for his loss of a great empire, or riches, unless he knew that he once was possessed of them, or they were at least his by Right ? How can any pain trouble a man which he feels not ? And if he feels it not, how can it be a punishment to him ? And to this I add, the Scripture saying, *God made man according to his own Image*, in *Genesis* : and in *St. James's* Epistle, *After the similitude of God* : How is it less than blasphemous, that a sinful guilty creature, such as man must needs be, having a wicked Spirit put into him, should be said to be according to Gods Image or likeness ? And how can it consist with the Scripture elsewhere saying, *God made man upright ; but they have found out many inventions ?* For though the Evil Spirit, supposed to be put into man, were the

*Isidore Penhor.*  
*Ep. L. 4. Ep.*  
163.

*Guliel. Paris.*  
*De Universo.*

*Gen. 1. 26.*  
*Jam. 3. 9.*

*Eccles. 7. 29.*



Author of its own wickedness, yet when once that was so wicked, for to put it into man is to make man wicked.

Now this Image of God, so much spoken of in Scripture, and treated of by Divines, to the great honour of Man, we may understand to consist in these five things Principally. 1. Wisdom and Knowledge 2. Liberty of Will. 3. Justice and Holiness. 4. Immortality, 5. Dominion. For when we speak of the Image of God in Man, we must be sure not to confound it with that proper to Christ, the Image of God. For first, that of man was made as we have heard, that of God, Christ, was neither made nor created, but begotten; and that not by way of Carnal Generation, but purely divine and Spiritual. Secondly, That was as well Eternal in respect of what is past, as what was to come: But the Image of God in Man, only everlasting, as to the future time. Thirdly, That of Christ was immediate: but that of Man mediate: So that he is not the Image of God, but as he is the Image of his more express and Natural Image, Christ: and that first, as is said in Wisdom. Christ being primarily called the *Wisdom of his Father*, and deriving of the same to us: For as St. John saith, *Of his fulness have all received, and Grace for Grace.* And God creating all things through his Natural Word, his Son, signified by that Metaphorical word expressed in the Book of *Genesis*, did in particular through him communicate that Wisdom unto *Adam*, which he excelled in, at his first Institution: whereby it was natural to him to understand the natures of all Creatures Earthly; as well from their Causes, from whence they proceeded, as from their effects proceeding from them: which latter is the principal means of attaining that remainder, and as it were ruins of a more perfect Body of knowledge in *Adam*, which we are capable of in the state we now are. And not only Natural things but Supernatural also, as God, and the Holy Spirits, were much more perfectly known to him than to us. So that the knowledge of the First man exceeded all after him (Christ the Second *Adam* only excepted) in these three things. First, in the manner of enjoying that knowledge which he had: it being not acquired by tedious and experimental discursiveness, observations, or reasoning within himself, but by a divine illumination: which was not given him after the manner of Revelations given by God to some of his eminent Servants, transiently; not to continue, or to descend to others, but it was by way of a connatural habit; which should have passed to his posterity. Secondly, the object of this knowledge or extent of it transcended that of Man now adays, stretching it self to heavenly, as well as Earthly things, and the minuter things lying hid from us. Thirdly, It differed in the manner, and perfection as being more accurate, and less Fallible than ours.

The Second thing shining eminently in *Adam* was *Liberty* of will, whereby he resembled his Creatour, who is the only absolute and Free Agent: For there was no natural inclination nor temptation in him to err or offend in choosing the Evil, and refusing Good: according to that of *Syracides* *God himself made man from the beginning and left him in the hand of his Council, &c.* Leaving it equally in his power and choice to turn to the Right hand, or to the Left, to stand or fall. And not only freely to do what he did, though propelled thereunto; but freely to Act or not to act: which is the perfectest and most proper freedom of all.

From this twofold perfection of the Understanding and Will arose a Third, which was perfect Innocency and Holiness: which by some is called Original Justice: and by others Original Grace; both aiming at the same thing:

John. 1. 16

Eccles. 15. 14.

thing: For *Original Justice* or Righteousness it may be called because it was not acquired, but connatural and simultaneous to the Being of Man: Again, It was Grace, because though it pleased God to create man with it, yet he might also have created him without it, and it was separable from him, and so not intrinsic to his very nature. Which is yet thus further to be understood, that it were most absurd and blasphemous to believe that God could make a man a sinner without any precedent or concurrent act of his own will, or without this original innocency and Justice; for as nothing but God can proceed immediately and directly from God's hand; so neither could man, as he was the effect of God, be any otherwise than Good. This then may be called his natural and Original Justice, and Goodness, and Original Grace also in some sense, because though all the works of God must needs be good, as his: yet man (for example) might not have been so perfect either in his understanding and will, and yet have retained innocency. And this was the Grace of God: Besides which may probably be asserted another Grace, which to the bare stock of Nature thus put together by God, superadded a more special and Free Grace called (though not very properly) the Grace of Sanctification, not as it is in us, purifying and restoring us in some competent manner to what hath been decayed or depraved by the fraud and power of the Devil in us, or our own vile hearts and affections; but by way of Preservation, preventing the evils and dangers unto which we were subject. Now this, as it is called *Grace* because it was not necessarily due to nature; So was it called *Natural* or *Original*, because God conferred the same at our first being, and would so have continued it, had we not abused and forfeited the same.

And from hence sprang a *Fourth* beam of the bright Image of God in man, viz. *Immortality*, as an appendage to the said Natural Justice, and a reward of the perseverance in it. For God saying, *In the day thou eatest thereof [the tree of the knowledge of Good and Evil] Thou shalt surely die*, did imply that so long as he persevered in due subjection and obedience to his will, he should not dye. So that *Adam* was not simply and in his own nature immortal, as were Angels, and immaterial Spirits, but by this Supernatural Priviledg, and Grace of Justice given of God: whereby he was well able to persevere in that state of Holiness, and secure himself from falling into sin; And a sufficient argument of the former is, that Man before his fall, did, or was to eat and drink, as appeareth from the indulgence of God to him, saying, *Of every tree of the Garden thou mayst eat*. Now eating and drinking do necessarily of themselves infer such an alteration both in the body eating, and eaten, as tendeth to corruption, and therefore a more immediate hand and power of God was required to obviate that propensity. And the manner of propagation being contrary to the imagination of some of the Ancients by that natural way that now it is, though much purer, prove the same inclination to dissolution, and the necessity of a Divine Grace to secure man from Corruption. And thirdly, it is proved from the manner of the Fall, which spoiled us not of any thing natural, in a proper sense to us: but lost to us the Supernatural Aids, which otherwise should never have forsaken us.

Lastly, a Fifth Beam of the Image of God in man was, and is the Dominion he hath over the inferiour Creatures, and the subserviency of them to him: For this an express Charter is given to him as Gods Vicegerent on Earth,

Gen. 2. 17.

Gen. 2. 16.

- Gen. 1. 28. Earth, in *Genesis* in this manner, *And God blessed them, and God said unto them, Be fruitful and multiply, and replenish the Earth and subdue it, and have dominion over the fish of the Sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over every living thing, that moveth upon the Earth.* Which Right of Rule was not altogether extinguished after the Fall, but as experience sheweth that man partly by strength; and partly by wit and understanding bringeth all things under him; so the Scripture affirmeth, *Every kind of Beasts and of Birds and things in the sea is tamed, and hath been tamed of Mankind.* And after the Flood, God in especial manner re-enstated man in his right of dominion, saying, *The fear of you, and the dread of you shall be upon every Beast of the Earth, and upon every Fowl of the Air, upon all that moveth upon the Earth, and upon all the Fishes of the Sea, into your hand are they delivered.*
- Jam. 3. 7.
- Gen. 3. 2.

## CHAP.



## CHAP. VIII.

*Of the Second General act of God towards the Creature, especially Man, his Providence. Aristotles opinion and Epicurus's rejected. What is Providence. Three things propounded of Providence. And First the Ground of it, the Knowledge of God. How God knoweth all things future, as present. Of Necessity and Contingencies, how they may consist with Gods Omniscience.*

**T**HUS far of the Power of God exemplified chiefly in man: It follows now that we speak of the Second General Act of God towards the Creature, and specially Man, known to be his Providence. The Providence of God is one of those things, saith *Clemens Alexandrinus*, of which to desire a demonstration or proof is most absurd, it so manifestly displaying itself over the whole Universe. And therefore next to that opinion of *Epicurus* denying God to take any Care of things in the world (lest it should trouble him too much) is that of *Aristotle* in absurdity and impiety that his Care and providence extended no farther than the Heavens; committing, as it were, the management of this inferiour world to inferiour Officers: both so unworthy of wise men to affirm, that we shall bestow no other confutation of them, than what obliquely may be inferred from the positive assertion of this divine Attribute of God. For God being in *Being* and *Power* infinite, and as the Apostle saith, *upholding all things by the word of his Power*: that is, meer will and pleasure declared, it were ridiculous to conceive any toil or labour in Gods conservation and administration of all the things in the world. As it were most absurd to say, that the glorious body of the Sun and the influences thereof should be disparaged in giving vertue unto Gnats and Nits, and pittiful weeds growing out of the earth, and not confining it self to more high and excellent Offices. But *Providence* is (as *Boetius* defines it) *that Highest Reason residing in that Supream Prince of all things, which disposes all things*. And surely, if God did not foul his fingers or degrade himself in making man as well as Angels, and Beasts as well as Man; and Earth, and Water, and Air, as well as Beasts; (and that to us there may be such things which we call clean and unclean, but to God there is no such distinctions in the natures of things) then truly could it be no blemish to him to regard them being made. And if to make them was no labour properly so called (though it is so termed by the Scripture for our instruction) to preserve them can be nothing of molestation to God: *My Father worketh hitherto and I work* saith Christ of God and himself, in *St. John*; meaning nothing

*Clem. Alex.  
Strom. 5. pag.  
547.  
Vid Theodor.  
Harcticar. Fa-  
bul. L. 5. C. 10.*

*Heb. 4. 3.*

*Boetius de Con-  
solat. Lib. 4.  
Prof. 6.*

*Joh. 5. 17*

nothing more than a continued Creation; as Conservation is well called by Philosophers, or an Act of Providence proportionable to the Act of Creation infinitely easie to God, as well as Effectual towards the Creature.

The thing then being thus declared and supposed, we shall consider it in this threefold manner. First, in the foundation and Ground, or Preparation of his Divine Providence. Secondly, in the Execution of it. Thirdly, in the Object of it.

And concerning the First, Providence being an Act of infinite Supreme wisdom, as *Boetius* saith; doth suppose knowledge in God. And the exercise or Execution hereof implies a Will in God so inclined. And the Object; the Effect of both. For, as the Apostle saith, *Who hath resisted his will?*

Rom. 9. 19.

*Lactantius de Ira*  
Cup. 9.

*Salust ad C.*  
*far de Reipub.*  
*Ordinan.*

And as to the Knowledge of God; it hath been before shewed, how it must be commensurate unto God himself, and that is Infinite. He must be and is Omniscient. And therefore well hath *Lactantius* said, *If there be a God, certainly he is Providential as God: neither can Deity be otherwise ascribed to him, but as he retaineth things past, knows things present, and foresees things future, or to come.* And truly, I cannot but here infer, besides my General purpose, the most excellent saying of the Heathen *Salust*; *It appears to one as a certain truth that the Divine Nature inspects the life of all Mortals: and that neither the Good, nor Evil Acts of men go for nothing, but naturally there follows different rewards for Good and Evil men.* This Reward is that outward ground inferring Providence: but the Inward taken from God himself, is his Knowledge or Omniscience: which the better to judge of, we may distinguish according to the Object of it, into knowledge of it, into knowledge of things within himself, or of himself, which is more Internal; and things without himself, external.

1 Joh. 3. 2.

For if we should speak more Properly, God knoweth nothing by an absolute direct knowledge, but himself; and all other things, Relatively; rather; according as they bare relation to him in *being* or *not being*; in being like him as that which is Good, or dislike him, by which manner he understandeth Evil. And nothing but God himself can perfectly know God, no not the highest and most divine Spirits attending him more immediately in the state of Glory: because perfect knowledge doth not consist in an Apprehension that God is, or that he is infinitely glorious and Perfect: but in comprehension to know him as he is. True: *St. John* saith, *We shall know him as he is:* meaning that in the state of glory we should have a much nearer and clearer access unto his divine nature, than we can have here by the Organ of our Faith: And that so we shall see him, that there will be no more use of Faith, or outward information from revealed doctrines, but Inward Revelations and illuminations shall immediately flow into us from God, to the fuller apprehension of him, and satisfaction of the restless mind of man. But to know him, as he is, is the Property of himself incommunicable to any Creature. For *to comprehend a thing*, saith *Austin*, *is nothing else but so to know it, that nothing of it should be unknown to the Knower.* As a Vessel is said to contain such a quantity of liquor, that nothing should be left out. And thus God only, and no Created being conceiveth God comprehensively.

The Relative knowledge of God in order to things external, is to be estimated according to the Variety of things so known by him: yea not only the knowledge, but even the very *Being* of God is described unto us; according

according to the manner of outward things : All things of reality, and not merely imaginary, are by general consent divided into three sorts, according to the three distinctions of time : Into things *Past*, *Future*, and *Present*. And therefore God is said to be, *He which is, and which was, and which is to come.* Therefore surely the distinction of Gods knowledge most agreeably to the nature of God and things known too, is, into that of things *Past*, *Present*, and to *Come*. Rev. i. 4. 8.

And there being no great difficulty or difference among Christians concerning the two former ; *viz.* Knowledge of things past and present, all concurring that the knowledge of things passed, never passes with God, nor of things present, nor of future, but the Knowledge of all these being immediately and immoveably present with God, so that many more warily, will have all understanding in God to be rather Science, than *Præ-science*; and Knowledge, rather than *fore-knowledge* : It were needless, as well as endless, to enlarge thereupon.

The third, about things to come, deserves more accurate enquiry. For, as to the distinction of Gods knowledge into that of *Vision*, whereby he beholds all really existent things ; whether in themselves past, present, or future : And that of *Intelligence*, it may be questioned, as common as it is. For we speak not of possible, but actual knowledge : but that which may possibly be, but never shall be (the object of the supposed Intelligence of God) is only a possible knowledge, and not a real : and therefore, not to be matched with real knowledge. For to say, God knows the possibilities, is no more than to say, not that he knows the things, but himself, in whom, and to whom all things are possible.

Therefore confining our Discourse only to things future, we are to observe such to be, either necessary or contingent ; there being no mean between these two. And here first, What is that which denominates a thing necessary ? and what contingent, or accidental ? and then, in what respect they are so called and distinguished ? And here, first, we are to distinguish of necessity it self, with the Schools. For there is a *simple* and *absolute* Necessity ; the contrary to which is altogether impossible, and so nothing but God is of Necessity. For God being absolute and supream over all things, as nothing can, by way of anticipation, lay a necessity upon him ; so neither can any thing afterward obstruct or necessarily impede his will : For as *St. Paul* saith, *Who hath resisted his will ?* It neither hath been at any time, nor can possibly be, That Gods *resolute Will* should be opposed so as not to obtain its designed end. But there is a conditional Necessity which they call Hypothetical, which hath no such simple and original certainty, but dependent upon somewhat else. And this Dependance or Conditionality is either upon *The first Cause*, which is God ; or some *second Cause*, the Creature. For there was no such absolute Necessity that this visible world should have a Being, but this *Being* depended upon the Will and Pleasure of God. And this world being, there was no necessity that it should consist of so many parts, or several kinds of things, but this depended upon the wisdom and pleasure of God also. The other Hypothetical Necessity was founded by the First Cause, God, in the Creature ; upon supposition that it had a *Being*, that such should be the nature of it : As that, supposing the Sun, it necessarily followed it should give light ; and supposing there be such a thing as Fire in the world, there is a necessity it should heat and burn : Of all which there can no other reason be render'd but that which *Scotus* gives, *Because this is this, and that is that* : And because the Creatour of them and all things else hath imposed such a Law unalterable upon the very na-



tures of things themselves; that upon supposal they have a Being, such, and such it should be. And this I take to be that Necessity which Philosophers call a *Necessity of Consequent*: viz. that which is immediately consequent to the being of a Thing: that of *Consequence* (as they call it) being nothing else but a rational Inference following upon some Particular supposed: As the *Genus* is alwayes supposed to the *Species*, and not on the contrary. For example; He that runs, must of necessity move: and he that moves, must of necessity be: but not on the contrary. And the ground of these and all such things, Necessity, is taken from the immutable decree of God, who hath so determined that things should be: And not only is this true in things apparent and visible to us, but must necessary be no less true in things invisible, and to us obscure and uncertain: viz. That upon supposal of such a peremptory Decree and Cause from God, that which seems to us most contingent and casual must have a most certain and inevitable event; even not inferiour to any of those necessities we have touched: and the reason is plain, because here is supposed the same will, and same power to effect this, as them: and the variety and uncertainty of the means, whereby a thing is brought about, makes nothing at all against this; because this proceeds only from the relation such means have to our understanding, and apprehension: which not being able to discern any connexion natural between the Cause and the Effect, do look upon the effect as meer chance. For instance, that a fly should kill a man by choking him is as contingent a thing as can ordinarily happen: And who could believe it, that should be told that such a fly moving lightly and wildly it knows not whether it self, perhaps a mile off from the place where this falls out, and many dayes before the fact, should certainly be the death of such a man: yet no man of reason and conscience can deny, but Gods providence and decree may impose an inevitable necessity upon this creature so opportunely and fitly to move as that it should certainly kill him, and that at such a time, and in such a place. And if any should hereof doubt, the expresse affeeration of our Saviour Christ in the Gospel may satisfie him herein, saying; One Sparrow shall not fall on the ground without your Father. If any should so contrive our Saviours words as to understand *without Gods will*, to be contrary only to Gods will, and not of Gods will concurring and his knowledge noting the same, St. Luke will instruct him otherwise, who renders the same speech, *Not one is forgotten*: which implies Observation, and Providence.

That therefore those things which seem to us most free, irregular, and contingent, may have a tacit and unknown determination from God, which should fix and infallibly limit them to some special ends, I may presume no man can piously doubt: and especially after that great Opposer of Gods Providence over humane actions, hath been constrained to acknowledge so much, I mean *Socinus*: who granteth God the liberty and power so to determine the Salvation, as well as the acceptation and improvement of Grace offered to *Peter* and to *Paul*, that the effect should inevitably follow: which being allowed, all the arguments usually brought by him and others (not of his rank) of the inconsistency of such inevitable decrees with the freedom of Mans will, will lie as heavy upon him to solve, or answer in his cases, as on any other, who should extend the same to many more than he pleases to do. For can we any more conceive that Gods good will to them should first make them brutes, before it made them Saints in limiting their choice and determining the same to one side, rather than others? or that he should extinguish a natural humane principle in them, to bring them to salvation; but

secure

*Nihil est adeo  
contingens  
quin in se ali-  
quid necessari-  
um habeat.  
Thom. 1. Q.  
86. art. 3. co.*

Matth. 10. 29.

Luke 12. 6.

*Præf. H. cap. 6.*

secure it to others? I hope not. I therefore if a necessity destroyed not their humane Liberty, how can it be concluded that it doth it in others? Or that there is no possible concord between Necessity and Contingencie. Indeed in the same respect, it must necessarily be true; whether we regard God or Man: For neither to God, nor to Man, can the same thing be allowed to be necessary and contingent at the same time: but there appears no reason, why the same thing, which is necessarily to follow on the part of God, may not be said, on the part of man, to be fortuitous, free, and chance, as it is called. For we indeed vulgarly call that only *necessary*, where there appears a necessary connexion in nature, between cause and effect: and according to the degree of evidence and assurance to us, we hold a thing necessary or contingent; in which sense we hold it necessary, that an heavy body, out of its natural place, should (left to it self) descend to it and possess it. And we hold it not so necessary, that the Sun going down in a cleer red evening towards the West, should portend the day following to be fair and cleer: Our Saviour, when he affirmed this, spake after the observations and opinion of men, which generally herein fail not. So that the being of a thing really, and the appearing of it so to be, being so far different in nature, it follows not at all, that so it is intrinsically, and of it self; because we can make no other judgment of it than in such a manner: and that because we perceive no natural connexion between the cause and effect necessitating it, therefore, there neither is, nor can be any. Some things God hath ordained so openly, inseparable one from the other, that we easily and readily infer the one from or by the other: and this is all we call necessity, in nature. But if God more covertly and subtilty hath likewise ordained the like connexion, not by a Law of constant Nature, but his singular will (for which we can find out no reason) this we presently call Contingent; though it be as certain as the other. And names being given to things by man, according as they are apprehended, the distinction of things into Necessary and Contingent is very reasonable, and serviceable to man; as signifying to him such a diversity of Effects in the world, that some have apparent natural necessary cause to produce them: and these things we call Necessary; and some things have no such natural causes, but more immediately are ordered by God bringing causes by his special Providence together, besides their nature, to produce such an Effect; and that certainly, though not naturally; and this we call Contingent.

That this manner of proceeding of the Providence of God, is possible; is impossible to be desired. And in many things seeming to us as casual as may be, that actually they are all granted. For to us, considering all circumstances, it was a thing meerly indifferent and undetermined, whether *Peter* should believe unto Salvation or not? but considering the resolute Providence of God disposing certainly outward causes, it was certain and infallible. The great question must then be about the General; *viz.* Whether God hath two immutable Laws whereby a necessity doth attend all effects, as well such as we term free and contingent, as such as are necessary; with this difference only, that on some things he hath laid a Law natural which ordinarily and necessarily moveth to one certain effect and end, as are seen in natural generations and corruptions, as that, as *St. Paul* saith, *Every seed should have its own body; i. e.* produce it. And that whatever is so generated should, by a Law of Nature also incline to dissolution again. And that by a private invisible Law which reserves to him, or particular decree he certainly bringeth to pass even those things

1 Cor. 15.

of which we can give no reason, and there appears to us no connexion or order of causes; but causes are by his special hand brought to effect such things, as in their general nature they had no tendency unto? The distinction common amongst Philosophers of *Fortuna* and *Casus*; i.e. Fortune and Casualty; and calling that *Fortune* which contingently falls out to free Intelligent Agents acting: and that *Casualty*, which besides natural intention, happens to fall out, may seem to clear this. For if we should affirm that in natural things there were no such indifference really, but all things were precisely and particularly determined by God in his private counsel, however a wide latitude seemeth to us to be left them, to move, and act; or not to act; or to move and act thus; or not thus, but contrariwise; no great absurdity or inconvenience would follow. For what absurdity could be inferred, if a man should say, That the Eagle letting fall a Tortoise upon the bald head of the Philosopher of *Syracuse* walking in the field, and so beating out his brains, was determined necessarily so to do of God: or that the tree that fell down in a wind and killed him that walked out to preserve himself from the fall of his house, which he feared, was inevitably appointed so to do? These effects did not proceed from the nature of these causes themselves, but a Superiour hand: and yet might be no less necessary than such effects, of which the common reason of man can give an ordinary and easie account. And if this be granted in some things, it doth lye upon them who deny it in all, to render a reason of the difference, and not on them who affirm a paritie, by infinite instances to prove: it being sufficient to say, There can nothing be shown to the contrary. But in things rational, and endowed with a power of Election and Rejection, it must be confessed, that the difficulty is much greater, because there seems to be a repugnance to free will, in such tacit necessity, and God should seem to take away with one hand, what he had given with the other. And therefore, of this in a more convenient place; after we have spoken somewhat preparatory thereunto, concerning the Decrees of God; which are internal acts of the Providence of God.

CHAP.



## CHAP. IX.

*The method of enquiring into the Nature and Attributes of God: Vorstius his grounds of distinguishing the Attributes of God from his Nature, examined. Of the Decrees of God depending on his Understanding and Will. Of knowledge of Intelligence. Vision, and the supposed Middle knowledge: The Impertinencie of this Middle knowledge invented in God. How Free Agents can be known by God in their uncertain choice. Indifferent Actions in respect of Man not so in respect of God. All Vision in God supposes certainly in the thing known.*

**I**F the Holy Scriptures leaving us many precedents, have thereby warranted, or at least permitted us to speak of God after the manner of Mans body, ascribing unto him head, eyes, mouth, hands and feet; and, the better to perceive the things of God, much more may we be allowed (if at all to search into Gods nature) to regulate our enquiry of God from the nature of mans mind, and the more supream acts of his soul. The first Act of which is his apprehension and knowledge; with judgment following thereupon. The next in order is the Act of his will; and this Order we may best follow in the enquiry into Gods Providence, which is constituted (according as we can judge) of knowledge and will, whose proper act it is, to decree.

And here first, It is requisite that we take notice of the folly and gross impiety of *Vorstius*, a late Pragmatick in Divine Mysteries: who would needs distinguish God from himself, and taking him at his word, wherein, speaking after the manner of men, such diversity is mentioned, concludes that God and his Attributes, are really distinct in nature, one from another. And why did he not, by the same rule, conclude that Gods very *Being*, his Essence was distinct really from it self, as well as from the supposed Accidents he (Epicurean-like) feigns to God. For God is no less affirmed to have heart, hands, and feet, than to have Understanding and Will: And if it be granted, there is a figurative and no proper sense in the one case, why may it not be in the other? And that God is all these things *Eminently*, but not after the formality of mankind.

The matter will be cleared better by examining his prime arguments taken from the Decrees of God, our present subject. First, sayes he, The decrees of God are various and many: but the Essence of God is but one: therefore

therefore they must be really distinct. To which the answer is as obvious; as the argument presumptuous: That if the Decrees were really many, they must of necessity be really distinct as well from themselves, as God. But their plurality is rather Relative than Absolute. All the Acts of God being but one pure simple Act, as in him; but denominated divers from the event, or relation they bear to the Creature. This is one of the first principles in his Christian Catechise; and why did he (pretending to reason) leap over this, and not first disprove it; and then proceed to his arguments? It was a great piece of folly therefore in him to prove a real distinction of Gods Attributes before he had proved that the Nature of God was compounded, or would admit of any such opposition. For they who deny this, will certainly deny that.

Another of his reasons is, The decrees of God are free; because they might have not been, as well as have been. But Gods nature is not so. *Answ.* There is a twofold freedom in the Decrees of God. The one in respect of the Nature of God; as God is precisely considered, which, abstracting from all Acts, was indifferent to others, as well as those Decrees made: And the other in respect of the Creature or object, which was capable of other Decrees; and therefore were Gods Decrees said to be free: but we all know that distinction of Instants in Order and Nature, do not infer a necessary distinction in duration: but that both Nature and Decrees might be coequal in eternity. Now all things that are eternal are in some case necessary. And the Schools have such a distinction of Decrees, as they have of nature; viz. *Decretum Decretans*, and *Decretum Decretatum*, meaning that the Decrees of God are sometimes used for the Act of God decreeing, and sometimes for the thing decreed: And of this latter it may be said, That the Decree of God is produced and made (which is a third special argument of *Vorstius*;) but of the other, it cannot so be affirmed: but it may flow from him by an eternal Law, or Volition within himself, and not at all occasioned by the Creature. And it is therefore said to be free, because it was not imposed upon him, and therefore necessary, because not accessory to him or contingent; but proceeding from him, as a natural and necessary, yet voluntary Agent. For we must not look upon God as subject to the condition of the Creature, in whom natural necessity is not compatible with voluntary freedom; but with God it may: because no Creatures natures and wills are the same really, or formally; but the Nature of the Creatour and his will are formally distinct, and admit deservedly of a diverse conception, but really are the same: so that notwithstanding it is harsh to the apprehension to conceive, yet the thing it self may be, and really is so. Which ground laid doth resolve that doubt also, concerning the generation of Christ, which is said to be both voluntary and natural, and necessary: Voluntary and free, because not constrained; and again necessary, because not indifferent, or possible to be otherwise: for as much as it is not possible that God should not have been, and Christ is God. Yet must we here put a wide difference between the Decrees of God in reference to the Creature; and the Paternal Act in reference to God the Son. For in this latter, we cannot so much as suppose an antecedent Decree; but only a natural Volition: In the former, we may conceive both a Decree going before, and a Prescience antecedent to that Decree.

Now as to the nature of Gods Decrees themselves, we are to consider that a Decree being an Act principally of the Will, and the Act of the Will in order of Nature posteriour to the Acts of the Understanding; it ought first

first be enquired what Relation the Knowledge and Decrees of God bear one towards another. And here we must resume the received distinction of Knowledge of *Simple Intelligence*, as they call it, or pure Understanding; and the Knowledge of *Vision* in God: By the first is meant the understanding of all things possible to come to pass by the Divine Power, to which nothing is impossible: By the Second, the understanding of all things future. And because things future are so various as we have shown, that some are future necessarily, and some unnecessarily; therefore hath there been invented, and with much applause offered to the world, a Third kind of Knowledge of God, termed [*Media Scientia*] the *Mean Knowledge*; as coming between both the former; and having for its object, neither that which by a simple necessity shall come to pass, nor that which is simply uncertain and contingent; but though in nature of outward causes contingent, upon supposition made, certain and infallible to God. To all which, I offer these exceptions, first that this last distinction seemeth altogether superfluous, or gives occasion altogether as just to introduce innumerable other, no less reasonable than that. For if from such small variety in the object, as we shall show this to be founded on, new distinctions are to be coyned, there will never be any end of distinguishing Gods Knowledge. For if for conditionate things, a conditionate knowledge ought to be invented and acknowledged, then likewise according to the discrimination of conditions found in the Object, a different knowledge is to be imagined and distinguished in God: which were confusion and not distinction. Secondly, this mean or conditionate Knowledge cannot be entertained by sober men as a distinct *Species* from the other two more ancient, but as a Part of that called the Science of *Vision*, whereby all future things are known to God: as being it self, about future things though with a condition. For all things are either future, or not future: If they be not future, but only possible to come to pass, then are they the objects of that *Simple Intelligence*, though very improperly, as is said: If they be future, then are they the object of *Vision* in God. Again, if of future things, some being absolutely necessary, and some conditional only; ought we not rather to conform the Act of Vision to the Object; and distinguish Vision into that of things certain and absolute; and of things certain only upon a supposed condition, then to frame a *new nothing* to explicate something, which was clearer without it? The thing we oppose not, nor forty such more, as might be no less reasonably imposed on the world; but the impertinencie, vanity, fraud of the terms, occasioning greater obscurity and contention than the world was acquainted with before. Thirdly, the very supposition here made to found this distinction will not hold the tryal; that is, that there is any thing so absolutely future, that it should come to pass without a Condition: or that there were any knowledge in God not conditional, in reference to created things, unless we should peradventure except the first matter of all, made of nothing, and to which no outward or natural Cause did concur, but the immediate will and decree of God produced it: but to all other effects from the beginning of the world to the end of it, somewhat of the nature of a condition was required to bring them to pass; even to man was required earth. And God did not so absolutely, by his Prescience or Vision see man future, but a Condition was taken into that knowledge; viz. matter preceeding: however he might have produced him without it. And not to multiply Instances to this purpose, God doth not fore-see, or see that any natural or necessary Cause should take effect, but upon the condition of the due application of Actives and Passives. Therefore the  
sum



sum of all; and the best end we can make here seems to me to be this: That we distinguish Conditional Knowledge in God, into that of *Natural Agents*, and *Free Agents*. For as God sees some things future upon supposition of a capacity nature is put into, to Act, as that a Stone should move downward upon supposition that it be first removed from the Centre, and then that Impediments be with-drawn (for otherwise he sees only that it is moveable down-ward,) so doth he see some things future, upon supposition that Free Agents be put into a capacity to exert themselves: As that, at St. Pauls preaching at Athens, *Dionysius the Areopagite*, and *Damaris* should cleave to him; but the far greater number of Auditors should forsake him, at his preaching of Christ.

The main doubt here to be resolved will be this, What certainty there can be in Free Agents to found an infallible knowledge in God, seeing if they be not certainly known determined, they cannot be certainly known as determined? for this were to know them a-miss, and would be an error. And to be determinable, is quite another thing from knowing them actually determined. Again, If they be determined, and that certainly; (For uncertain determination is no determination, in truth) how can they be said to be free, and have the power of Election? To this it was wont to be replied by virtue of *Media scientia*, or *middle kind of knowledge* in God: That God doth not see effects infallibly to flow from such Free Agents, because of any antecedent influence inclining certainly the will to one way; but by virtue of that general stock of liberty with which he hath endowed Rational Agents to act freely, he sees, upon such and such circumstances and proposals, the Will of it self to move one way; which such self-determination being known to God renders him truly Prescient and Omniscient, and that without error.

But this will not stand the encounter. For Gods knowledge about the Creature, being wholly conditional, as we have shewed (supposing the application of natural Causes in natural Effects, and free Causes, to free Effects) there will be no Cause to be found, or imagined in nature, why two equally by nature Free, shall extreamly differ in their choice of the same object: How can that be known which neither hath a being in it self, nor its Causes? But the Case in hand is such. For the Object being the same to both, and the Subject being the same in both, Freedom of Will to chose: it is not intelligible how it should be fore-seen, that one will certainly tend this way, and the other, the Contrary. And if there be a difference in the Wills, St. Augustines question so often and pressingly urged against the *Pelagians*, out of St. Paul, will put them hard to it to answer; viz. *Who made thee to differ?* and, *what hast thou that thou hast not received?* Comes it from a mans self, as free? If so, then it should come from all alike, where all are alike free: and if all be not alike free, then there is difference made to their hand, and not by themselves. Again, the common Argument will be of no ordinary force upon them, which layeth this undeniable and unshaken foundation, *That God is the Cause of all Causes, and the First mover in all natural actions and motions*: but here (as some of the Schoolmen, and amongst others *Swarez* by name hath it) God should stand still, look on, and await for a time, the first self-motion of the Creature, without any pre-moving vertue effectual to the end; and see whether he will turn to the right hand, or to the left, before he knows any thing of certainty concerning that.

But they proceed farther, and say, That God having indued the Free Agent with sufficient abilities to Act, the original cause of Acting must be himself,

himself, and so his universality of Cause saived to him. But to this we reply, That three things are to be considered in indifferent Actions; The Power to Act, which is indifferent: The Determination of this power to one, which takes off the indifferencie; and the Action it self, which in the execution, is necessary: because as the Axiome hath it, *Every thing when it is, necessarily is.* Now the latter indeed may be ascribed to God, as likewise the first; as the true Author, upon general concessions of power; but the second cannot: because (what I think hath not been considered) there is a distinction to be made between the power of Acting, or not Acting, and Acting this or the contrary to it; and the power of determining it self to one, rather than the other. For if, as in an equal ballance, the two Scales of mans Free-will are so evenly posited, that they are no more propense to one, than the other side, the Affirmative, or Negative; doth it not necessarily follow there must be the help of a finger, or such thing, to make a difference; though the least touch will do it? So that the power of moving up or down is plainly one thing, and the power of determining the same, quite another here, and so likewise in mans Free-will made free, and thus indifferent by Grace; which they call sufficient: though this will not be allowed by such as require a particular and immediate converse of God to all Actions; as did likewise the most Philosophical Heathens, as I could show. From whence we may collect that God seeing nothing but what has a real being, in it self or Causes; and the Power of Acting being not sufficient to give a being to an effect, but the Execution of that Power: if this Execution hath no cause, it cannot be known; and it hath no immediate cause until man hath actual being, according to that opinion that makes man the absolute cause of determining his actions, and not God: For surely man cannot determine before he hath existence, and therefore it cannot be, and therefore neither known to be, so much as future: For man before he is, can give no causality to this determination; and they say God doth give none; Therefore it is not at all, and cannot at all be known of God. Neither can it be said, That things future are Real Beings, though not Actual and Present, and so may be known of God: because that which is future cannot be actually known but as it is actual, and not simply future; and therefore is the knowledge of God by more accurate speakers truly called *Vision*, rather than *Prævision*. And those things that are future as to their proper Existence, are present as to their Causes in Gods counsels, but if there be no such to be found with God, then can there be no such Causes at all: For that cannot be said to be the Cause of a thing which at the same time is the Cause equally of the contrary, or contradiction to that thing: but the undetermined will of Man is indifferent to both sitting still or walking, at the same time; no cause inclining to one, more than other: which should found a certain knowledge of one, and not of the other.

## CHAP. X.

*Four doubts cleared concerning the Knowledge and Decrees of God ; and Free Agents, and Contingent Effects. How man that infallibly acts is responsible for his Actions. The frivolous Evasion of the said difficulties by them of Dort.*

**T**O the vindicating the former Discourse from just reprehension, it will here be expected that we explain our selves in answer to these following Quarries. First, *Whether the knowledge of God be the Cause of things future ; or things future the Cause of his knowledge ?* or otherwise, *Whether God knows a thing because it shall come to pass ; or, It shall come to pass, because God knows it ?*

In answer to which, we must distinguish a twofold knowledge in God. An *Ideal* knowledge and a *Real* knowledge (as we may be allowed to speak after the manner of Men, reserving still to God his absolute simplicity.) The *Ideal* knowledge of God is that, whereby he perfectly knows all things in their proper forms, which are possible, and intelligible : And this doth not depend at all upon his Decrees, which we make the Cause of all Existence in the Creature ; but the Decrees of God depend upon this : God decreeing nothing to be future, which he first by simple intuition beholds not in its proper Nature and Circumstances ; as men of Contemplation first weigh the nature, means, and ends of things, before they resolve upon them. But the *Real* knowledge, which we signally so call because it relates to the Real Existence of the thing so known, does certainly depend upon the antecedent Decree of God : no possible reason being to be rendred, why God should know a thing to be, but because it is certainly, and not fallibly to him, to be : And no possible reason being to be found, why a thing should so infallibly be to him, but because he hath resolved & decreed that so it shall be. From whence may be reconciled the frequent sayings of the Ancient, and some Modern Divines, who have said, That God fore-sees a thing because it is to be : and not that it is, because God sees it. For the seeing of a thing *absolutely* and the seeing it to *be*, are vastly distinct notions. And most true is that observation to be found (as I remember) amongst Philosophers concerning the difference between the Understanding of God, and its Object ; and the Understanding of Man, or Angel, and its object. For in the Intellectual Part (for I use the word *Understanding* now, and not for the Act, as even now) of the Creature, Understanding is caused from, and by the Object, to the faculty represented ; and the Object makes the knowledge, and not the knowledge the Object : But on the contrary, the Understanding of God is many times operative, and makes its object.



A Second capital Doubt will be, *How such a perpetual and infallible Causation in the Creatour, upon the very Understanding and Will of the Creature Rational, can consist with the native Prerogative of Liberty of Will, given by the same hand to it?*

The Answer to this hath cost many a Volume, with no great satisfaction: and therefore how little may be expected from this *Compendium*, every equal Judge will easily see. I shall forbear Citations of other mens opinions and authorities, for brevity sake: And endeavour first by a description of Liberty of Will; and next by a Distinction of Necessity (which is commonly lookt on as the cut-throat of Liberty) to contribute something to the easing this difficulty.

And first, we are to distinguish of Free-will, as in Mankind, in General, from that which may be found in any one Individual man. For when the noted place of *Ecclesiasticus* (which I will not quarrel at because it is only *Ecclesiasticus*) tells us, *God made man from the beginning, and left him in the hand of his Counsel.* What doth it more say, Then that God dealt not so straitly with mankind as with other kinds of Creatures inferiour to him? He left it undetermined in the nature of man, to do this or that. And humane nature had such a measure of Wisdom, Understanding, Reason, and Counsel put into it, of God, that there was such a power of choosing and refusing, as no other Creature could claim; and there was not the like natural restraint upon Mans will, as upon Beasts will, considered still in the general Notion. And surely, this is no small difference, whereof man may glory above beasts: which is not wholly lost to man, though in particular there should be found a determination of Mans will to one. Secondly, Liberty is made up of two things necessarily, the Acts of Reason, and the Acts of Will. If any such determination were made of Mans actions in the Individual, that Reason were lockt up, and could not stir, or move in man; or when reason out of its native power, remaining, did argue and debate things variously, there were no power left in the Will to follow the Dictates of it, but was driven like an horse in a Cart, by the fierce voice and whip of the stander-by, then indeed all pretense to true Liberty must needs perish, because here were a Co-action of the Agent moving him to one thing. Co-action, as hath been granted by the strictest defenders of Grace, is against Liberty, and they show by most numerous Authorities, and sufficient Reasons that this is the only enemy to Freedom. For as *St. Austin* hath it, *This a man is said to have in his Power, which if he wills he may do; If he wills not, he may not do.* And *Hugo de Victore* doth yet more expressly define Liberty to be, *An Ability of the Rational Will, whereby, through the Co-operation of Grace, it chooseth Good; and it deserting it, Evil.* By which it should appear that there is no inconsistency with the Co-operation of God though infallibly moving to one, and the Election of the Will: as will yet be more clear in the second thing here principally to be distinguished; viz, Necessity, which I make either in Co-ordinate or Subordinate Causes: and directly deny, That Necessity in Causes subordinate one to another, doth quite destroy Liberty or Free-will: especially if we subdivide Necessity of things in subordination, into subordination to the first Cause of all, and of second Causes. I grant that in Causes co-ordinate, as Man and Beast; or Man and Man acting upon distinct principles, and ends, *Necessitation* from the One, quite ruins the Freedom of the other; and is unnatural and violent, being purely an external cause, giving no power to

*Eccles. 15. 14.*

*Aug. de Spiritu  
et Litera, cap.  
31.*

the Will to move, but exciting and impelling it against the judgment and more rational conclusion of the understanding, to accept the terms given. But Necessity proceeding from the *First and Supreme Cause*, God himself, to whom all inferior Causes are subordinate, doth not take away the native Freedom of Man. The Reason whereof is, because the concurrence of the First Cause is not extrinsecal to the Natural Agent, but really intrinsecal to it, and essential. And therefore the division of Causes by Logicians, into Internal, as Matter and Form: and External, Efficient and end; holds good only in secondary Efficients, and not in the first, and universal Agent. For though it be most true that the Absolute nature and Being of God is quite distinct from created beings, and extrinsecal: yet it is not so, as he is a Cause. The reason of this will make it undeniable: because, as is agreed by Christian Philosophers, the act of Creation in God is essential to the Creature, so produced; and the act of Conservation is a perpetuation of that act creative in God; and therefore, also must needs be intrinsecal to the Creature; and the act of Gods concurrence moving the Creature and so determining it, is no other but a branch of that conservative act in God; and so is intrinsecal to the Creature, that what the Creature doth, by virtue of such influence, it may no less be said to do, of it self (there being a Coalition of both acts, created and increated in one) than it may be said to subsist of it self, by its matter and form, of which it consists. And this *St. Pauls doctrine* declares to us, where he puts no difference between our *living, moving, and having our being* in God, all alike depending on him, and be equally intrinsecal to all. And therefore Gods action terminated in man, becomes his, as much as those which we conceive to proceed from his own being: and notwithstanding to this act of God primarily may be ascribed the turning, as it were, of the Scales of the Will, yet may man also be said herein to determine himself: the reason whereof is, That both the first Cause and the second are here total Causes. But here I call to mind a *Maxime* amongst Logicians, and others teaching of Natural Causes: *That it is not possible that Two total Causes should be subordinate*, as principal and instrumental Cause, one to the other; but must alwayes be Coordinate: as two horses moving a Chariot, no otherwise than one might well do alone; and two Candles giving but one light to the same place. I might question this Axiome, and the Instances both, because in the first, though both Horses are the Causes equally of such a motion, and so total: yet the immediate causes are not total: For it is certain, that the same force which is used by one, not rising to that of both, would not in like manner move the Chariot, that both actually do; though there be nothing more easie then for one so to move it. Neither are two Candles total Causes of that degree of light which is in the Room, though of light they may be: But whether these mine exceptions against the presumed Rule be rational or not, it matters not at present; it being to me certain that it holds only in secondary Causes joyntly working, and not in the concurrent motions of first and secondary Causes; because of the essential dependence the second Cause hath upon the first. So that *St. Basil* saith highly and truly, *The Divine word* (and that is here as much to say as *the Divine vertue*) *is the nature of things produced.*

Acts 17.28.

\*Αλλὰ ὁ θεὸς  
ἀνὴρ οὐκ ἐστίν  
ἐν τῇ φύσει.  
Basil. in  
Hexaem.  
Hom. 8.

There remains yet one more difficulty to be here touched, to which many may be reduced, and that is, That Man being thus determined and lying under this necessity of Acting, he cannot in justice be responsible for his Actions, whether good or evil. He cannot be the subject of praise or dispraise. All preaching

preaching by Exhortation and Detortation; All reward of Punishment and Benefits; Lastly, All Prayers, and the use of it, must needs cease.

To these in order briefly; And first in general, denying the reasonableness or validity of such consequences, upon this common ground. That if indeed this were a necessity from a Co-ordinate Cause, not natural to the Agent moved by it, then it were to be lookt on as no act proper, and free in the Creature, but strange to it, and violent, and by consequence refunding all praise and dispraise upon the unresistible impulse of that external Cause: but this is internal, natural, and one act really, of the first and second Mover: and so properly, principally (as any Creature can be said to be principal Agent under the Creature) and totally is the act of the second Cause; which in external motions, otherwise than from God, it is not. And if it be said, that from hence would follow, The Creature acting evilly, that this Evil might be equally imputable, unto God, and to the Creature; It may be replied, that two things are to be consider'd in Actions; the nature of the Action it self; and the morality of it. And that all things being good in nature, the act it self is good and may be imputed to God, though the morality of the act be otherwise. But it may be demanded yet further: Have not this morality it self a Nature, and consequently upon the grounds, laid imputable to God, as well when the act offends against justice and honesty, as when it agrees with both? To this. Nature indeed (as hath upon another occasion been shewed) is sometimes taken very largely for any thing that hath a being, but here we take it only in the physical sense, whereby things are said to have a proper being. But Good and Evil are rather *modi reales* (as they speak in Metaphysics) than *res*; *Manners of Being* rather than *proper Beings* of themselves. Again we must, and do hold with *Austine* that, Evil morally taken hath not such a real being as Good hath: but is only the absence or privation of Good; being no real Entity; and we pity, rather than fear such an argument as we have found against this, that if Evil be nothing, then God should be angry for nothing, when he is offended at sin. For surely there is a great difference between Gods being angry for nothing, and Gods being angry with nothing. What would they say, I marvel, when the Father in the Gospel commanded his Son to go work in his vineyard, and he would not go? might he not be angry, even because there was nothing done? And must this be called, being angry for nothing? So surely, God may be angry with mans doing nothing. Here in order to a more full account may be given of the objection, we leave in pawn this distinction, of the *Act of Sin*; and the *Sin of the Act*: And that God may concur to the former constantly, and never have a finger in the latter, which is properly the sinfulness.

Now to the matter of praise or dispraise: of which they are only said to be capable, who act freely and upon election, and not upon necessity; I make no scruple directly to deny the truth of it, as famous as it is amongst the Fathers & Philosophers, absolutely taken. Nothing is more plain than the contrary, every day: For we praise handsome Horses, and handsome Men, and infinite other things when there was not the least concurrence of the will, but God and Nature did all, to such a laudable state; much less any act conducing thereunto. And do we not in our Judgments discommend the disproportions of natural monsters and creeples, though we out of affection and pity, declare not so much to their reproach? And this seems to have deceived *Aristotle* in his *Ethicks* (who laid it down for a current Rule) that he distinguished not these two. For certainly, Commendation and Discommendation rightly used, are the effects of our Judgment, and Will, and



and Affections. But more nearly to the case, we answer, That such Praise and Dispraise are only vacated by such a necessity as is extrinsecal to, and contrary to the will: but where the Act is affectedly done, there a supposed necessity doth not exempt from such Rewards of Praise and Dispraise, or Punishment or Benefits. But it is certain a man may strongly affect that which he cannot choose but do.

And the like may be answered to that of Instruction, Exhortation, and Dehortation; all which, they say, ought to cease, and would become unnecessary if mans will were so immoveably determined to one thing. Yea all Prayers and Deprecations were to no purpose. And why so? because it is not in mans power to relieve himself: and whatever he saith, believeth, or doth, nothing can do any good, if the Decree be so against him: and nothing of all these omitted, or the contrary committed, hurt or endanger him; such a Decree being for him. And what grounds of comfort to a troubled mind may be laid, the Case thus standing? This is the sum of all we are (here at least) bound to take notice of. And this were much more than it seems to be, were it so, that they, who hold the contrary opinions, were not obliged as really (I say not in the same respects) to answer these difficulties. For who is there that doth not hold an *intuitive* knowledge of God of all things future? but they deny what the others affirm, That such knowledge is operative or decretory upon the will of man, to infallibly determine it; but will have Man be the Author of such his resolution only; and God to look on, and see it done, but not to do it. Well, be it so for once: yet still the Will is certainly and irrevocably determined, or God could have no knowledge of it, but what is conjectural, and as unworthy of God, as the Creature is unworthy of Omniscience. And if such unalterable state of the Will and Actions be allowed in man; it is not material, at present, to enquire from whence this Determination proceeded; from God, or from Man: we granting here, That if God had no hand in it, but Man, exclusively to God, was the cause of it, then the account would seem more grievous, and the case more foul on mans part. This I say, is not much to our present purpose, which is to enquire of the Fact, whether so it be, or not determined: and that so it is, appears, that God sees it is so. And if it be so, do not all those fore-mentioned inconveniencies come strongly upon them? Mans destiny is certain by his own Act: he is unalterably now determined, he cannot go back: God sees it is to be so with him, and therefore so it shall certainly be: And therefore what do we trouble our selves, or such an one with instructing him, exhorting, threatening, promising him. It is too late, now: This should have been done many thousands of years before he was born, and before it was known by God for certain, that he will go this way: For God now by the vertue of his conditionate middle knowledge doth infallibly know it shall be thus, & not thus. And as the servant in the Gospel said of *Jairus* his daughter, *Thy daughter is dead, trouble not the Master.* Thy lor is read, trouble not God with your Prayers and impertinent services, nor your self with unprofitable cares. I would gladly learn (for as yet I profess I know nothing of) what they would answer to these things, to which with such confidence, and courage, and importunity, and a great deal more, they demand satisfaction from others, as if they were not at all concerned to unriddle this Mystery, or could do it with the turning of an hand; both which I deny, unless they recur to what we have insinuated here, that man is by their grounds made more the Author of his own ruine, and God more cleared and vindicated in his Justice. But this I may grant, and

and yet still have no satisfaction in that under question, How, without vanity and idleness, a man may take any pains about such an one, or minister any comfort to him? accuse him, and confound him he may a great deal more, by upbraiding him with his own ruin. *Socinus* indeed, that great wild Boar in Christs vineyard, who hath to his power rooted up the first Principles of Christianity, and sometimes (as in this case) of some natural Reason and Philosophy, to plant his bastard slips, comes off very roundly and easily, by denying any certain knowledge in God, whether conditionate or inconditionate, of things contingently future, as especially those of the Free Will: and thus to set man up-right upon his leggs, he brings God upon his knees.

Now because it is not so much my drift to show what cannot be said, as what may; I shall attempt to give some answer to the Objection upon the grounds I rest on, and here choose; desiring and expecting more clear and full satisfaction to them, when they shall have removed the obstructions they are obliged to clear this point of, who are of another judgment. And first we must remember, That according to our Grounds, man doth determine himself to Good or Evil, notwithstanding God doth it too. Secondly, we hold that there is no such absolute determination of Man by God or Man, which taketh not so in with it, the proper conditions and means conducing thereunto. God nor Man do not resolve upon good or evil without the proposal of the allurements of both, and the means conducing unto both. And 'tis generally agreed, That the Will of man cannot tend towards God (since his Fall) without the first Grace freely and irrespectively given, and that it is of the same nature and order to the restitution or recreation of his soul; as was the first Matter to the framing of his Body. And therefore, as that first matter was such that man could not be made in Gods order, without it; and yet was not so necessarily made by it, but that he might never have been; or any thing else might have been made of it, had God so pleased: So the first Grace to Regeneration is absolutely necessary, but it is not absolutely necessary that where this first Grace is, Regeneration should follow; or the will of Man certainly incline to embrace it: For to embrace it, is an act of Spiritual life, and no Vital act can be exercised, but by a Vital Principle. And the first Grace is not so much a Principle of Actual Life, as a necessary Preparation to it. And therefore is required by all, that second Grace, which giveth life: and a power of acting answerable to that life. Which power is actuated by the sweet concurrence of God, and the Will of man determining to one. Now, as where many things may equally come to pass, yet one thing eventually doth necessarily happen, and not the other: So is it in this self-determination of Man: Inevitable it is, that one way be chosen, and there is an Eventual necessity that one takes effect, but this is not from the Nature of the will of Man, necessary. And being from the nature of the thing unnecessary; it must needs be unknown to man. And being unknown to man, can never oblige him to adhere to one part more than the other: and consequently, being thus free, common reason will direct, and almost constrain him to act and carry himself, as undetermined and free. For 'tis as certain and true a Rule in Divinity as other Faculties. *Not to appear, and not to be, is in effect the same thing to a man.* Now it is impossible, without supernatural Revelation (above the Scripture) which we never read, was ever heard of, and have no grounds it shall ever befall any man, that any man should know that he hath conspired so irreversibly with the Justice of God,

God, as never to move to Good and be saved. For when the Scripture hath laid down this as a fundamental Rule: *The Son of man is come to save that which was lost.* And again, *Christ came not to judge the world, but to save the world.* And St. Peter in the *Acts* sayes, not only to them present but to all men indifferently, *Repent and be baptised every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost: For the promise is unto you and your Children, and to all that are far off; even as many as the Lord your God shall call.* And St. Paul to the Romans, *Now the Righteousness of God without the Law is manifested, being witnessed by the Law and the Prophets. Even the Righteousness of God, which is by Faith of Jesus Christ, unto all, and upon all them that believe; for there is no difference.* And to these many other like places of Scripture may be added, declaring no man destined to incredulity or impenitency aforehand, until such time as he hath declared against both, and that to the end of his Life. But on the other side rather, that God puts no difference. Now if St. Pauls argument held good (as certainly it did) that a wife should not put away her husband who was an Infidel, nor the believing husband his wife, upon the grounds of ignorance of a good event: Should a man put away his Soul? *For what knowest thou, O wife, whether thou shalt save thy husband? Or how knowest thou, O man, whether thou shalt save thy wife?* So, what knowest thou, O man (who doubtst of Gods Decrees) whether thou shalt save thy soul? Whence we may conclude, That it is no ground of discomfort that the event is determined: for it is equal on our side, as much as against us: but it is the ground of all reasonable satisfaction from the General Law requiring obedience Evangelical, and from the Promises made without any discrimination: which a man cannot apply to his disadvantage or discouragement, without being first guilty of unreasonableness and unnaturalness to himself. Now Religion, and the designs thereof, do suppose a man a true natural man to himself, before it attempts to draw him to an higher good, or nobler ends. So that if a man will deny his own natural reason, and self-love due to himself, such a man is indeed no fit person to be treated with, any more than a direct mad man: but this natural reason suggests to him, that where he knows it not to be an invincible Evil which he is to contend with, and knows not but that the way is as easie, the door as open, the means as effectual to him as any man living, to attain happiness, he is to take heart and courage, and resolution to effect his desires. For to omit a certain duty of Faith and Hope, upon an obscure and uncertain ground is monstrous and ridiculous. I conclude therefore, that, as almost all the actions of mans life, yea and his life it self, which are no less determined with God, then the state of Grace or Wickedness, Glory, or Misery, do not cause him to suspend endeavours leading to the end propounded to himself; so neither in the Concernments of his soul, keeping his natural Reason to himself entire, can he obstinately refuse to act according to the ends of Religion. Yet I might adde this also, which is most true; that if it were revealed to a man that he should never escape damnation, do he what he can, or what he will; yet that desperate carelessness and looseness could not be but greatest stupidity, because God doth certainly proportion salvation and damnation, as to the degrees of them, to the degrees of Holiness and Sins in this Life; and therefore it were more than worth a mans time and diligence, by a more restrained and Christian conversation, to obtain a mitigation of the evil he so fears. And yet that part of the argument



argument commonly used, which saith, That it is in vain for a man who is so determined to strive to free himself, and to abound in religious acts; is directly false, and to be denied. For no good works shall go unrewarded: And this is no less infallibly true, *That to him that hath, shall more be given*, and to him that doth righteousness: and to them who by patient continuance in well-doing, seek for glory and honour and immortality; eternal life. And that the external acts and means are effectual to these great ends, Christ tells us saying, *To you that hear shall more be given*, than that Gods Grace is necessarily required to all true Conversion and Holiness. Matth. 13. 20.  
Rom. 2. 8, 10.  
Mark 4. 24.

I know those of *Dort* following *Calvine* and *Peter Martyr*, and such of eminencie in Reforming, answer otherwise; But in truth their Reply is no Answer. For granting an invincible state of unregenerateness, and a total insufficiencie in Man to free himself, without the effectual Grace of God, yea, and an irreversibleness in Gods Decrees, so that all endeavours and acts should be frustrated to the obtaining the blessed end generally promised, and the terror of those under this Necessity; they oppose only good counsel to this, and much more; and reprove them lightly at least that meditate too much on the severer part of Gods Decrees, the abstruser Counsels of him, and determinations to the taking them off from those good duties, which God without exception requires of all. But all this and the like to this, is very little or nothing to the purpose: For they certainly hereby betray their Cause, and grant the whole argument to be good, and duly to infer all that is intended by it: only they oppose barely the Conclusion, and would not have it take place; though they can find no fault with that it is grounded on: What a miserable shift is it for any, who are not able to deny that, upon their own reason, such a thing follows; to say, Yea, but this ought not to be, and to perswade contrary to conviction of themselves, as well as others: But occasion will be given of these matters more fully, in what follows.

## CHAP. XI.

*Of the Execution of Gods Providence in the Predestination and Reprobation of Man. How the Decrees and Providence of God are distinguished. The Reason and Method of Gods Decrees. Righteousness is the Effect and not Cause of Predestination to Life. Predestination diversly taken in Scripture, as also Election and Vocation. God predestinates no man simply to Death without consideration of Evil fore-going, as Calvin and some others would have it.*

Rom. 9. 20.  
Job 9. 12.

Πάντων Χει-  
μάτων μύστης  
ἐν σοφίᾳ καὶ  
ἐν δυνάμει  
ἐστὶν ὁ θεὸς οὐκ  
ἐστὶν ὁμοιω-  
σάμενος  
ἐστὶν. Protagoras  
apud Laertium  
in Vita.

Aug. in Civ.  
Dei, lib. 5. c. 11.

**G**OD having in his secret, mysterious Counsels, ordained all things according to his Divine will and pleasure, without being liable to that saueie expostulation of any Creature, *Why hast thou made me thus? or, What doest thou?* (For 'tis as certain, as there is a God, that God neither doth nor can do any injury to the Creature, though man may, and often doth injure him, and himself too, in mis-representing him) he proceedeth next to the execution of his Decrees and Counsels, which are so many acts of his Providence: And because it would be much too long and extravagant, to turn to the more diffused acts thereof, considerable in all his Creatures, we shall confine our selves to those specially concerning Man, the measure of all other Creatures, as the Philosopher said; and, as Christian doctrine tell us, the Head and Crown of all; and these, as to the religious capacity of Man, chiefly. In which are eminent, *Predestination, Election, Vocation, Salvation.* And *Reprobation and Damnation*, on the other side.

*Predestination* and the Decree of God, if in any thing they differ, it may seem to be chiefly in this, that use hath made Decree of a more large signification, containing the act of Gods supream Providence over all his Creatures; but *Predestination* is more properly appertaining to Man. Some have thought good yet farther to proceed in limiting the term *Predestination*, to the Elect only, and such as shall be saved; but St. *Augustine*, and others that follow him, make it common to both the Saved and Damned. And *Augustine* speaking of the two Cities in the world, that of God, and that of the Devil, saith, *One is predestinated to reign for ever with God: the other to endure eternal punishment with the Devil.* And so in several other places, which here I omit. *Calvine* is famous for the like freedom of speech in the *Predestination* of men to Damnation, and to *Beza*, and *Martyr*, and *Arctim*, and almost who not, that were of that Reformation? but the opinion

opinion of these must not pass for *Austins* opinion, without this remarkable distinction. *Austine*, and such Fathers as followed him (and it was some hundred of years before any Father of repute in the Church presumed to confront him in his known doctrines, in this point) affirmed an infallible Predestination to Life and Death: but he did not so affirm it; that this should be done absolutely, without any consideration of the way and means leading thereunto: this those Divines now named held, and those of *Dort* generally, called the *Supralapsarian way*, very irrationally and impiously. Their main reason is this, That God could not be subject to so much inconsiderateness, and imprudence, as no man of ordinary reason could be guilty of: *viz.* To make a thing before he knows what to do with it. First therefore they conclude, That God must propound to himself a certain end, and that not common and general, which is his Glory: but special, to each man in the last state of all: and thence infer, That he must (as men call for several tools, or instruments for several works, and ends) predestinate the means thereunto. This argument was used long before *Calvine*, by *Scotus*, and in effect the same, though mine'd a little by him: who declares plainly that God must first propound to himself an end, and then order the means agreeable to that end. Yet is *Scotus* suffer'd to pass, and little said to him: But *Calvine* bears all the blame. And surely blame-worthy he is. As on the other side, that later, rank, and careless Pen which would, by no means suffer that there should inevitable destruction attend any man of Gods making, because, forsooth, this were to make God like to a foolish workman, who should make a curious work, only to destroy it, and break it to pieces. But setting aside the odiousness of the comparison, the thing it self supposed is false, and that many ways: First, that it would be such a piece of impardonable folly in a man to make a thing which he resolved to destroy again, when he had done his will with it. It is indeed hard to conceive that any man should be so stupid as to have no end of a thing, but that it might not be, so soon as it hath a beginning: for surely, either profit or delight intermediate was the principal, and rational Motives thereunto; and therefore secondarily he might ordain the very dissolution of his work: as a man doth, who having made a curious mould, breaks it to pieces, and so at first intended, before it was made; so soon as he had perfected his more principal intention. But were it so that this could not be done without extream folly on mans part; yet the same might be done without the least just suspicion of mistake on Gods part. For man is certainly a fool who studieth or laboureth about a thing which bringeth him no real advantage, or destroyes a thing which doth. But God receiving no such advantage from the saved, or such disadvantage from the damned; where is the imprudence? But last of all, Damnation is indeed destruction in the vulgar, but not proper sense. The Person of the damned is as entire as to his state of natural being as is that of the saved. And God may have his ends of glory, and certainly hath, from the misery of the Creature. But both this opinion and that of *Calvine* seem to make the ultimate tearm of Man the ultimate end of God, though it be but for this arguments sake, and cannot do it generally or really. But the contrary is plainly the truer: that God propoundeth no other ultimate end than himself in his acts of Creation and Providence. And therefore, though God hath revealed himself (an act of his free Grace) in his holy Word, that he willeth not the death of a sinner: and much less of a person that is innocent before him; and it were most blasphemous

*Si enim de nihilo creavit omnia non idcirco facit, ut perderet quæ creavit: sed ut illius misericordiam quæ creata sunt salventur.*  
Hieronymus in cap. 12. Zachariae.



to Gods truth and mercy to attrin, that, as the case stands between him and man, he will, or may condemn to everlasting pains, Man not justly deserving them, yet there appears not any reason, considering the absolute dominion of the Creature belonging to him, that of himself he might not so have disposed of him. They may say, That God in justice can take away no more than he gave to his Creature : be it so. The capacity of the beatifical Vision God gave man : and therefore may take it away: And what is that but extreame misery? *Chrysostome* makes the loss of Gods glorious presence to be greater than the pains of sense suffered by the damned. And do we not see thus much before our eyes frequently, That God causes many to come into this world, who wear-out a miserable life without any good day, in continual languishings and sicknesses? Surely this is not without cause going before : But yet no more cause then is common to others, living in prosperity and ease.

This may be disputed, and perhaps, better omitted; but not so that opinion which makes irrelative Predestination to glory and misery, because God must first propound his end : making no great difference between the Predestination to the means of a good end, and the means towards a bad one : but that God, to bring about this, as well as that, doth with like concurrence, and will, design evil means to evil ends, as he doth good to good ends ; or that he is the direct Authour of sin to prepare men to damnation as he is of good acts leading to life and glory. These contain two great errors to be liked of no good Christian, for any mans great name, in Religion or Reformation. For it is first, certain, that though sometimes in Scripture, the same name may be ascribed to Gods Providence in both, yet it is in a far different sense : as the Relation that Gods hand and power hath towards things of a *Positive*, and real Nature, differs much from that, it hath towards things of nature *Negative* and *Privative*. Supposing then at present, the Fall of Man into sin and his liableness to the due wages or reward of sin, which necessarily follows thereupon, and the Mass (as they call it) of mankind to be corrupted, throughout ; (whatever is excepted to the contrary) there appears no reason why God out of his absolute Right and Liberty might not have neglected the whole, and *suffer'd* it to perish rather, than *design'd* it to ruin. Here then cometh in the discriminating will and hand of God : Some part of this he leaves, and some he chooseth. Some part he ordaineth especially and directly to Life and Grace ; and others suffering to fall into deserved ruin, he is said to *destine* or *predestinate* to perish ; and sometimes not only upon the stock of original pravity, odious sufficiently unto God, to provoke to that : but by actual and personal impieties and errors, naturally tending to such ends. So that as it is necessary there should be an hand to lift a man up, who is fallen down and maimed, but no necessity that any hand should keep him down, or cast him lower : in like manner, to the raising of any part of that depraved Lump, it was absolutely necessary Gods Divine assistance should put to its saving hand ; and these are said to be ordained, especially to Grace and Life : but suspending only, and denying the like grace and favour to others, he is said sometimes to ordain to death and sin, such ; though speaking strictly it be no more than not ordaining to the contrary. For it is much the like case, as to form of speech, which we use in Humane and Divine matters. *He (saith Christ) that is not with me is against me, and he that gathereth not with me, scattereth.* And our Saviour Christ rebuking the superstitious and morose Jews preferring their Sabbath before

*Quia universa  
ista Massa me-  
ritò damnata  
est, conumeli-  
am debitam  
reddit justitia,  
honorem inde-  
bitum reddit  
gratia, Aug. in  
sexto Epist.  
105.*

before the life of a man, saith, *I will ask you one thing. Is it lawful on the Sabbath dayes to do good, or to do Evil? to save life or to destroy it?* implying hereby, that it had been to destroy this impotent Creature, not to deliver him from the evil he was in: So likewise, speaking after the phrase and opinion of men (which the Scriptures do no less than humane Authours) God is said to be against a man, when he is not for him, and to destroy him, when he saveth not his life, as *Lactantius* in a certain place writeth thus. *He that may help one that is ready to perish, and doth not help him, he slayes him.* And if God may be said actually to destroy such, by withdrawing, or with-holding his saving Grace, denying his favour; may he not be said reasonably and soberly to ordain such to destruction, when only he doth not ordain him to Salvation?

*Qui succurrere  
perituro potest  
si non succur-  
rit occidit.  
Lactan.*

There are two things which may seem to cross this: One that an imputation may seem to fall on God, that he doth not that himself (being much more pitiful and good by nature, to his Creatures, than they are to one another) which he requireth, under pain of his displeasure, that men should do to one another; *viz.* relieve in necessity. This is no hard matter to answer, seeing the case is quite different; and we know no such law that is or can be upon God to do all the good he can, unto the Creature; as there is upon man to do so to his brother. But Man himself is not tyed by God to do a favour to other, whereby damage should ensue unto himself: And much less, God obliged to shew mercy in such manner, that he might suffer in his Justice, or dominion over his creature; which are more conspicuous; yea and his Mercy too, as to the Degree, though not extent of it, in adjudging some to their demerits, while he rescues others from the like misery.

The other objection, which is principally *Calvines* above touched, is, That by this God should act unreasonably, not propounding a certain end to himself, if he did not directly design the punishment of his Creature; but, as we have said, indirectly and obliquely: as if God had in some Actions no direct and peremptory intention. but this doth not follow. For no doubt but God had a direct and positive end in creating every particular thing, and especially man: And that intention was agreeable altogether to his own Nature, and his own Works, which were all good, good to both one, and other. And to glorifie man, and be glorified by him, in giving him immortality and life, and that without exception; but yet not without condition: which condition being on mans part violated; What hinders but Gods secondary end and intention should be to return the fruits of mans doings upon himself, and that without exception? For as *St. Paul* saith, *All have sinned, and come short of the glory of God.* And all were in a state of Desertion and Reprobation. But what if God pleases, seeing his Creature fallen to decay, to make it over again in Christ Jesus, and propound to himself a new, and another end? A man hath a fair, handsome, and well-going horse: he chooseth him to himself to ride on: but he falls lame, and is turn'd off. He recovers him and puts him to his former use and ends: Is here any lightness or inconstancie in the owner? Are not all these things very reasonable? Could there be any such unreasonableness as to make one general and positive decree, that, come what will, his horse shall serve him to ride on? So undoubtedly, the general Decree, and first in nature and order, next to Gods glory, was in the creation of man, that he should serve him

*Rom. 3.23.*

*2 Cor. 5.17.*

Jude 4.

him to his glory, and to the benefit of himself. But Man mutilating himself and becoming unserviceable to God, his Owner, and Master, was not the Decree of God very wise and just ordaining him to be a cast-a-way, so long as he continued in that state? And then recovering him by the Mediation of Christ, to ordain as many as took their cure, to life everlasting, and glory: and those who were incurable, or not cured, to everlasting death: this latter is plainly attributed to God by St. *Jude*, telling us of some, *who were before ordained to condemnation*: that is, in the sense even now explained, given over to condemnation by God: If we may make humane methods of any use to us in arriving at the knowledge of Gods proceedings (as hath been generally received) why may we not judge thus of Gods order of Causes? Especially having the consent of the Scripture, which thus speaks frequently, according to the several occasions given? And if it be said to be absurd, thus to judge of God, as unsettled in his knowledge and judgment, and being regulated by emergencies, We can well answer, as in other points of *Anthropopathie*, or Gods compliance with Mans capacity in speaking after humane manner. And if God condescends, on purpose, that we should understand something of him to our edification, shall we transcend unnecessarily the limits of modesty, and content ourselves with no other order, or less knowledge than God himself hath of himself and wayes? Gods acts, several in respect of us, may be simple in respect of himself, and one: but denominated and discriminated variously from the divers habitude of the Object. The simple eternal Will and Law of God is this, that the Righteous shall be saved, and the Unrighteous damned: This is his Predestination in general of all mankind: subordinate to this, are the several intermediate changes, the first being immutable. And it concerneth not to enquire, What kind of Righteousness this is, or whence, or how man comes by it? Whether he hath it as original Justice given him immediately of God at his first institution? or whether he hath it superadded and derived from Christ? This is certain which St. *John* saith: *He that doth righteousness is righteous, even as he is righteous*: whether this Righteousness comes by Nature, or Grace. And this is another infallible Rule which St. *Peter* delivereth in his Sermon to *Cornelius*, *That God is no respecter of Persons: But in every Nation, he that feareth him and worketh Righteousness, is accepted of him*. Which is his most immutable Counsel and Decree of saving men: and the consideration whereof we should firmly and immoveably stick to and put in practise.

1 John 3. 7.

Acts 10. 34, 35

But because it is one principal part of our Righteousness, to agnize the Author and ground of it, that famous doubt ought here to be touched. Whether Righteousness be an effect of Predestination and Election, or the Cause thereof, with God.

Ephes. 1. 4, 5.

The answer to this doth require that we be first satisfied in these three things, Predestination, Election, and Vocation, and the importance of them: and principally to note in order hereunto, that however later Authors (especially from St. *Austins* time downward) have invented, and that usefully and reasonably enough, several significations and importances of them, which are not to be neglected; yet the Scriptures use them promiscuously: as may be seen from these instances; amongst many, *Ephesians* the first, the fourth and fifth, the Apostle saith, *According as he hath chosen, i. e. Elected us in him, before the foundation of the world, that we should be holy and without blame before him in love*



love. Having predestinated us unto the adoption of children, by Jesus Christ to himself, according to the good pleasure of his will. Where Beza himself in his Annotations will allow *Election* in the fourth verse, to signify the same as doth *Predestination* in the fifth. And that *Vocation* is taken for both may be gathered from St. Peters words, saying: *Who hath called us unto his eternal glory.* And it is as certain that St. Augustine also so confounds them, diverse times: nevertheless they have their distinct conceptions, which may be these. For first, *Predestination* or *Fore-ordination*, according to Scripture it self, will admit of a contrary object; And there is a *Predestination* to Evil as well as to Good, but in a different sense. For as we have shown, when God is said to ordain to Evil, it must be rather understood in the Negative sense, when he ordains not to Good, but delivers over men to the commission of sin. But *Election* is alwayes in a good sense, as is also *Vocation*: and are but so many progressions of Divine Providence in the salvation of the Faithful: and not specifically distinct *Species*, or kinds of acts: as doth appear from St. Pauls accurate use, and placing of them in his Epistle to the Romans. *Whom he did foreknow, he also did predestinate to be conformed to ——— Moreover, whom he did predestinate, them he also called; and whom he called, them he also justified; and whom he justified, them he also glorified.* Where the Apostle explaining the order of Gods proceeding in the saving of man, makes a commutation of terms expressing it. For here *Fore-knowledge* is not that simple Intuition whereby he knows all things, but that effectual knowledg, founded on a precedent Decree; which is the same with *Predestination*, as now commonly used. And that *Predestination* here is the same with *Election*, is probable from that it is added *to be conformed to the image of his Son*: and *Calling* is actuating of that *Election* and *Predestination*. So that *Predestination* is alwayes understood as an act of Gods counsel; and *Election* (when taken properly as distinct from that) is an act outward, whereby it pleaseth God to take to his special favour, certain persons, and pass over others: And *Vocation* seemeth to be nothing else strictly taken, than that outward means, or ministry whereby such are chosen to God: As a man first propounds several objects to himself, next he pitches upon one, and determines to take it; thirdly he actually makes choice of the same, by some special signal of his will. And this God commonly doing by word of mouth, calling him to him, hath given ground to that form of speech in Scripture of being *called*, and *calling*: the publication and ministration of the Gospel of Grace being that word of Gods mouth, by which a man is selected from the rout and refuse of the World, to the means of Grace, Justification, and Glory. This I take to be the simplest and soberest state of this perplexed mystery: In which I suppose it necessary to be advised how we stick too religiously to the terms *Predestination*, *Election*, and *Vocation*, because of their mutable signification in Scripture: which must needs confound an immutable adherer to any one sense precisely: and that such words must be understood rather from the relation they have one to another, and the matter treated of, as also the occasions, than according to any simple sound of them.

And therefore to return to the Question moved concerning Righteousness as an effect, or cause of *Predestination*, *Election*, and *Vocation*, it must be answered from the distinct consideration of these terms. For when all these (as sometimes) are Synonymous, and the same with that

Pre-

1 Pet. I. 10.

Rom. 8. 29, 30

Thom. 3. Q. 2.  
11. c.

De Spir. & Li.  
tera, ca. 7.

Rom. 2. v. 6.  
10.

Matth. 20. 23.  
Matth. 25. 34.  
35, 36, 37, 38.

Pre-determination of Almighty God to Grace (For there is a Predestination and Election and Vocation to Grace, as the means, as well as to Glory, the End,) then it can be; in no tolerable sense, said, That grace is the cause of such special acts of God. Neither doth any prevision in God of acceptance of grace, of compliance with, and obedience to Gods will, move to Elect, or Call any man: and that upon that sure ground of *Thomas*: because, *there can be no possible way of meriting without Grace, for Grace is the first Principle or beginning of all merit*: and nothing can be a cause, or so much as conduce to its own being: But the inclining of God to such a thing must come under the notion of meriting, or to speak more agreeably to our ears, *doing well before God*. And therefore they much more truly may be said to be the direct cause of Grace. And this not as some Pelagian Hereticks supposed, at last by constraint of argument; for the more ready and easie operation of mans will; but simply to will that which is good. Nay St. *Austine* saith, and that truly, the same of mans Understanding, as Will. *For he holds forth his mercy not because they do know, but to the end they may know: Neither because they are of a right heart, but that they may be right of heart, doth he hold forth his Righteousness whereby he justifieth the ungodly*. So that provision of good Works, or Faith, as the reason inclining God to confer Grace, simply, is altogether inconsistent with the Holy Scriptures, and the freeness of Gods grace asserted plentifully therein.

But there is another and farther term of Gods Predestination, Election, and Vocation, which is to his Kingdome of Glory, and the Reward not of the merit, but work of Faith and Holiness. And to these no doubt, but we are ordained and elected, and called as the end, by those means. This is that St. *Paul* intended in that place to the Romans above quoted: and in the second chapter; telling us, *God will render to every man according to his deeds. — and glory, honour, and peace to every man that worketh good, to the Jew first, and also to the Gentiles*. Christ tells us in the twentieth chapter of St. *Matthew*, that *to set on his right hand and on his left in his Kingdom, shall be given to them, for whom it is prepared*: and in the 25th, who they are for whom it is so prepared, from the foundation of the world; viz. the Righteous; and moreover, who are the Righteous: namely, such who abounded in good works there particularly mentioned. And to this may be referred most of those speeches at large, falling from the most eminent Fathers of the Church, before the time of *Austine*; wherein they affirm, that God elected some and not others, upon the fore-sight of good works in them, and obedience; others rejecting for their disobedience. Thus spake *Origen*, thus *Chrysostome*, *Nazianzene*, *Ambrose*, and *Hierome* too, who wrote as expressly as *Austine*, against such a freedom of the will which should give any occasion to God to confer his first Grace on man; all meaning no more than the election of man to glory, upon the intuition of Grace. Now if this opinion should be strained to the highest, it would not rise to this, that God did choose any man simply and primarily for his works sake, or his faith fore-seen; for, as is shewed, God elected simply to that, and not for that: but the most may be wrung out of it, is too great a propinquity to Merit: But neither doth this follow; seeing they, who say, God in such an order, i.e. after grace, & upon such an occasion, as those good works of which God is no less a principle cause than Man, doth choose to confer glory on a man, or ordain him to life, do not say, that such fore-seen works bear a proportion to such glory or reward. The Scriptures, which plainly affirm

affirms the former, exclude the latter, making it a matter of free promise in the original, and the gift of God, together with mans work; as especially to the Romans St. Paul doth; *Now being made free from sin, and become servants to God, ye have your fruit unto holiness, and the end everlasting life. For the wages of sin is death, but the gift of God is eternal life, through Jesus Christ.* There is nothing therefore more consonant to reason, nothing better reconciles the seeming jars of the ancient Fathers before, and about the time of *Austin*, with that more wary and exact state and defence of the Question concerning Gods election of man, upon pre-vision of Faith and Obedience, (always including Christs obedience and merits) and the freeness of his Grace in electing. And nothing reconciles the Scriptures more clearly, than the opinion which allows God to be the sole reason of his own will, and the author of his Grace of Sanctification and Salvation also; and yet holdeth such an order between these, that God doth not choose any man to his free and unmerited Grace of Salvation, but through and upon consideration (I do not say, valuable and proportionable in weight and worth, but in nature) of the state of Sanctification, going before. Does not St. Paul render it as a reason, why God was to be glorified in his Saints, when he came to take vengeance of his adversaries; *Because our testimony among you was believed?* And did not the Master of the Vineyard, who is Christ, fore-ordain a penny to the Labourers, in consideration of their labour foregoing? Doth not St. James say the very same, in these words? *Blessed is the man that endureth temptations, for when he is tried, he shall receive the Crown of life, which the Lord hath promised to them that love him.* Surely, that which man promiseth upon a condition, he doth not ordinarily bestow, before that condition be performed, but ordains it to follow upon it. And to the same purpose speaks St. John too in the *Apocalypse*, *Be thou faithful unto death, and I will give thee a Crown of life.*

Rom. 6. 22, 23.

2 Thes. 1. 10.  
Mat. 20. 2.

Jam. 1. 12.

Rev. 2. 10.

But perhaps they think, there remains some force in *Calvins* argument, still, against this; and that God must be obnoxious to that imprudence, that ordinary men are not, if he did not first propound the end, and then make all means to conform, and conduce to it; so that man should first be ordain'd to his end of glory or misery, before he is. All this I grant, and yet grant them nothing; and this is all they are like to get, from confounding the inward and secret acts of God, with his outward, or the Decrees of God, with the execution of them; as *Twiss* notoriously doth, in his entrance to the Animadversions, on the Conference between *Arminius* and *Junius*. It is certain, that God doth decree a man to his end, before he is; but doth he ordain him to such an end, before he ordains him to be at all? or doth God give him possession of Glory, before he gives him capacity?

Twissius Animadvers. in Collat. Armin. cum Jun. p. 1, 2.

The summe of what I am to say, is this, That, First, Gods Providence ordaineth that man shall be, and then ordaineth that he shall be of such a condition, and to such an end; and then he giveth him an actual Being; and then according to the state he is found in, brings him to his proper end; and not in that unnatural, preposterous, and irrational method, determines him absolutely to an end, before he determines his Being at all. And those places of Scripture alledged to defend this presumption, do rather overthrow it; as that amongst others, *The children being not yet born, neither having done any good or evil, that the purpose of God according to election might stand, not of works, but of him that calleth; it was said unto her,*

Rom. 9. ii, 12.



*The elder shall serve the younger.* I readily here grant a parity between Gods electing to spiritual and temporal ends, which this argument supposeth ; but I do not grant, That it was Gods purpose, that the elder should serve the younger, before it was his purpose that they both should be ; or that the execution of this Decree did not depend upon the execution of means leading unto it. So that, when it is said, *God first*, as man, *ordains the end, and then the means conducing unto it* ; it is true only, when it relates to the end of the *Ordainer*, not of the thing *ordained*, which hath its end really distinct from that general one. Man propoundeth to himself profit, and then ordains some proper means tending to it : He purposes to make a Statue, and then purposes to make him a Tool proper to that piece of work. He purposes indeed first that such work shall be done by a Tool, but he doth not purpose that this individual Tool shall do it, before it hath a Being : So God first purposeth his Glory, as the ultimate end ; next, he decreeth that man shall contribute to that end, in the several methods of accomplishing it ; but he doth not purpose, that any individual man, as *Jacob* and *Esau*, shall proceed this way, or that way, before he hath conceived a purpose to give them a Being. And thus farre of the first part of Gods Providence, in ordaining acts of Grace and Mercy.

---

**CHAP.**

## CHAP. XII.

*Of Gods Providence in the reprobation and damnation of Man. Preterition is without any cause personal, but the corruption of the Mass of humane Nature. Damnation alwayes supposes Sin.*

**A**S the former proceedings of God with mankind declared his Mercy, so do these here celebrate his Dominion and Justice, in order to the Creature. And as St. *Chrysostome* well observes in a certain Homily: As in a well-ordered City, it is as necessary there should be Prisons, and places of Execution, as places of honour, and bountiful rewards, propounded; so is it in the world: Gods wisdom, nay (*Chrysostome* in another place sayes) his mercy is as truly seen in ordaining Hell as Heaven, in that upon the thoughts of its torments many are reduced to sober and good life, whom vertue or promises of happinefs would not reclaim. But here we are to consider the manner and reason of Gods severity towards his Creature, in these two formidable acts of his just Providence.

Before we can make any tolerable description of which, it will be very necessary to distinguish them. For the total neglect hereof, (as with the author of *Gods Love to Mankind*, in the very entrance of his Book, confounding miserably these two) or the mistake in the due division, which error *Petavius* falls into, where he tells us, Divines are commonly wont to make a two-fold Reprobation; One, *negative*, as they call it, (*which is as much as Preterition*) or, not electing — The other, *Reprobation*, is *Positive*, whereby he not only passes by those persons, and relinquishes them, but also adjudges them to eternal punishment. And this displeases him so far, as to the ground of it, that he strains hard by the help of *Tertullian*, to make this a branch of *Marcions* Heresie, but in vain; for the things are in themselves really and worthily by many learned Divines, distinguished; but who are they that bungle so in the framing of such a distinction, I believe he no more can, than he doth tell. Reprobation we do indeed make Positive and Negative, but we make Damnation none of them; for we may distinguish a two-fold act in God and in Man, the one opposed to good, wanting in the object to be chosen, and that may be called, *Reprobation*, or refusal Negative, which refuses the object either upon meer absolute pleasure, or some such absence or want of good, which might make it eligible. The other is more Positive, when there is found somewhat in the object, which addeth unto the want of good, the presence of evil opposite and odious unto the chooser. Now taking Reprobation, as it is opposed to Predestination (as some do) then, as they say, Predestination supposeth nothing in the object to move God to ordain a thing simply, or respective-

Joan. Picus  
Mirandol. Cor-  
eluf. 6. secund.  
Thom.

ly, to such an end. So may it be said of Reprobation, that it necessarily supposes nothing in the object, causing God to turn from it; whereupon *Picus Mirandola* determines thus, according to *Thomas*: *A reason may be given from the divine goodness, of the Predestination of some, and the Reprobation of others; and the divine will is the only reason, that those he rejects, and chooses others unto glory.* This may well be allowed, from the supreme and absolute dominion of God over all things, so far especially as may amount to a denial of beatitude to the Creature capable of it, and a withdrawing of not only the Grace, but common influence of God from the Creature, upon which it should return, from whence it came to nothing. But it grates hard upon the natural goodness of God, to affirm, that the divine will should indulge so much to its absolute Sovereignty, as, no cause preceding, to conceive an hatred or indignation against the work of its own hands, as to sentence it directly to everlasting, or indeed momentary pains; seeing God cannot be unjust, or properly cruel one moment, any more than he can be eternally. Neither can he unreasonably afflict the body, or damnify a man in his estate, any more than he can punish the soul in Hell. Of all these therefore, the Question is but one, What ground can be assigned of Gods pleasure, or rather displeasure herein?

To this therefore according to the distinction mentioned, answer may be: That of the negative will of God, seen in Preterition, or not electing some to some high ends, (which we also call here negative Reprobation) no reason can be given, or ought to be sought, out of Gods divine will, as *Picus* hath rightly determined. But as commonly it is seen, when the Master of the Family is gone out, the house falls into disorder, and so finding it, he sentences his servants to their several punishments, or may turn them out of doors: So God having the liberty to depart from his Creature, at his pleasure, in this way of Preterition, whether Supralapsarian, or Sublapsarian, there doth, upon that, spring up from it, evil, and disorder in the soul, contrary to Gods will revealed, which he reflecting upon, may safely and justly decree to entertain it in his favour no longer, but reprobating it, adjudge it to the punishment deserved. God doth not therefore primarily (as some have boldly delivered) propound to himself the positive pains and ruine of any Creature, no inducement, no grounds going before, but he may very well in a negative sense, be said to reprobate it, not affording those preservatives needfull to its security.

This doth sufficiently appear, in the first act of his Reprobation of men and Angels, whom, without all doubt, he could have preserved in their original state; but he freely refused, and they both freely chose to leave him, and expose themselves to his severest judgement, which was by this positive Reprobation, to bring them under the effects of their sins, damnation. So that they who deny any cause out of God, of his first Reprobation, do not deny a cause sufficient of his second, and positive; but the Devils, and those men as are signaliz'd *Reprobates*, are undoubtedly the free and full authors of Gods reprobating them, and condemning them in this manner. Of the *Angels*, *St. Peter* and *Jude* speak expressly, rendering their offences, a reason why God proceeded so against them, and not the simple will of him. *God spared not the Angels that sinned; but cast them down to Hell, and delivered them to chains of darkness, to be reserved unto judgement.* And the same is repeated by *St. Jude*. And when God saith in his Covenant with *Adam*, *In the day thou eatest thereof, thou shalt surely dye:*

2 Pet. 2. 4.

Jude 6.  
Gen. 2. 17.



*dye*: he implyeth the reason of his Decree to punishment, to be sin. And when the Wise man exhorteth saying, *Seek not death in the error of your life, and pull not upon your selves destruction with your own hands*: he doth necessarily imply a direct cause in Man of his own ruine. And the words following exempt God from any hand in such things, as the Author. *For God* (saith he) *made not death, neither hath he pleasure in the destruction of the living*. And here comes in that, in its due place, though it were not intended of a spiritual or eternal destruction, *O Israel thou hast destroyed thy self*. For though without any supposition taken from the Creature, God may pass him over, and deny him grace and glory, yet doth he not design any man directly to damnation, but upon supposition of sin going before.

And from this state of things, may competent reconciliation be made to the seeming oppositions of Scripture, and to St. Austin himself. The Scriptures say, *Because thou hast rejected knowledge, I will also reject thee*. And *Hos. 4. 6.* by St. Matthew, *How often would I have gathered thy children together, even as a Hen gathereth her chickens under her wings, and ye would not?* And *Who-soever hath not, from him shall be taken, even that which he seemeth to have*. And St. John, *Ye will not come unto me that ye might have life*. And in the Acts, Paul and Barnabas, *It was necessary that the Word of God should first have been spoken unto you, but seeing ye put it from you, and judge your selves unworthy of everlasting life*. And St. Peter, *God is not willing that any should perish, &c.* And amongst others, that of the Prophet Esay must not be forgot, *And now O Inhabitants of Jerusalem and men of Judah, judge, I pray you, betwixt me and my Vineyard: What could I have done more to my Vineyard, that I have not done in it?* All which places, and divers more, do charge man altogether with his own misery. On the other side, in that the Scriptures tell us, how God made man according to his own image, whereof freedom of will was no small portion. And in *Deuteronomy*, *Ye have seen all that the Lord did before your eyes in the land of Egypt, unto Pharaoh and unto all his servants, and to all his Land. — Yet the Lord hath not given you an heart to perceive, and eyes to see, and ears to hear, unto this day*. And in *Jeremy*; *Turn thou me, O Lord, and I shall be turned*. And *Ezekiel*, *I will give you a new heart also, and a new spirit will I put into you, and will take away the stony heart of your flesh, and will give you an heart of flesh*. And St. Matthew, *All men cannot receive this saying, save they to whom it is given*. And Christ in St. John, saith, *No man can come unto me, except the Father, who hath sent me, draw him*. And elsewhere, *Therefore they could not believe, because Esaias said again, He hath blinded their eyes, and hardened their hearts*. And the whole ninth Chapter to the Romans mightily favours this side, of which the substance seems to be contained in this one Verse, *So then it is not of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth, but of God that sheweth mercy*. And to the *Philippians*, *To will and to do is of God*. These with others seem to deny liberty of will to man, and to ascribe the reason of good and evil, to which man is subject, to God, as the author, making man rather passive under both.

To that of Free-will, we may speak by and by. To the present case, taking in also what St. Austin saith, *God doth not forsake but where he is forsaken*; which may ill consist, with what he so largely and often delivers on the other side; we answer, by the help of the former distinction of *simple Preterition*, and *direct Reprobation*, and the effect of it, damnation, viz. That the foresaid places suppose an evil affection in the parties so rejected by God, and are to be interpreted of his just determination to punish sin, and

and hard-heartedness in them. But the incapacity of Grace and Conversion, and Salvation, are meant by the latter Texts, proceeding from the sole Preterition of God, refusing to prevent the evil and malignity of mens wills, which for want of that preventing Grace do certainly tend to evil, and are incurable of themselves.

But upon this I see divers shrewd Objections to arise; as, First, That by this with-holding of Gods Grace, his Preterition, there is brought a necessity upon mans will to evil, and his indifferency to life and death quite taken away, as all use of the means of Grace.

To this we have in good degree answered before, and there shewed, how that the fore-knowledge in God of mans fixed estate, whether by his own will electing, as they say, freely, or Gods will determining, (which fore-knowledge is yielded to God by these Objectors) doth oblige them, as well as me, to shew what profit it would be to man, to move or endeavour towards Grace and Life, when he is already determined; only this is the difference between them: The one seems to hold, That God by an antecedent act drives the nail, whereby man is immoveably fastned to one thing; and the other holds, That by a subsequent act of knowledge, he clincheth it, which man himself drove, so that it can never stir. St. Augustine confuting Tullies opinion of Fate impending over all things, doth notwithstanding confess, and affirm plainly, *They are much more to be tolerated, who hold a Sydereall Fate, than he that takes from God the praescience of things future; for, says he, it is most apparent madness for to grant there is a God, and to deny he foresees things future.* And they that put the question to this issue, have mended the matter very little, or reliev'd themselves, all necessity and certainty being a direct enemy to their design of setting man free to do what he list, and change his fortune (as we say) at his pleasure.

I find in a very grave and learned Author, a distinction which I find no where else, designed to ease this doubt, between *Inevitable* and *Infallible*, which in truth are not distinct; and therefore he is constrained contrary to the agreed way of speech, to make *Infallible* the same with Necessary, whereas the distinction is between Necessity and Infallibility, or Inevitability, which is the very same: For what is infallible, but that whose act or object shall have a certain event; and this event not to be avoided or declined, is called, Inevitable. But whether the Necessity of Causes be such, that this event must in nature succeed, is the question; and that notwithstanding the Inevitableness or Infallibility of the event, there may not be free motions in the Cause, tending to that event. So that, for instance, a man may freely choose and will to do that which he certainly shall choose; and consequently be properly and truly said to be author of the same, be it his damnation or salvation.

But you will say, If Gods Preterition be such, that a man is unable to move himself to saving good without it, then must he infallibly fall into sin, and necessarily, and after this, all counsels and comminations, and exhortations, come to nothing, and are in vain. Nay, unless there be unrighteousness with God, man cannot be judged for not doing that which he cannot do, is not in his power.

To this St. Augustines Answer is this, *Because the whole Mass was damned deservedly [ in Adam ] God repays its deserved reproach, and bestows an undeserved honour, by Grace, not by any prerogative of merit, not by necessity of Fate, not by the unsteadiness of fortune, but by the depth of the riches of the wisdom and knowledge of God, which the Apostle doth not open, but admires concealed, crying out, O the depth of the wisdom!*

Aug. Civ. Dei,  
l. 5. c. 5.

Aug. Epist. 105  
sixto.

*wisdom!* &c. But if this yet doth not absolutely satisfie, as I know, it doth not some, because, say they, it is to delude man to offer that, and exhort to that, which it is impossible to attain to; (so that though God by his absolute and divine Prerogative, might have deserted man, yet it stands not with his natural equity or simplicity towards his Creature, to exhort and threaten, when there is such inevitable necessity upon him, and condemn him for not doing that, which he knows he cannot do without him, refusing effectually to assist him.) I answer, It might very well call in question, the fair dealing of God towards his Creature, if so be he should make an act for him, after he was disabled to observe and perform the same, not assisting him to the performance of his will. But God doth not so; for though the Command stands in force against him, yet it was not prepared for him in his destitute condition; and no reason, that Gods right of ruling should change with the variety of the Creature. It suffices, that once it was proportionable to him, and that the impotency now pleaded is owing to himself, and that Gods Laws now are rather recited and propounded to him, than made for him, in the condition he is in. But secondly, Gods Commands indeed though but urged anew, should be ludicrous and in vain, did they totally miss of their ends, in being thus repeated and inculcated, if they had no success. But so it is not, *as though the Word of God had taken no effect.* For they are Rom. 9. 6.  
*not all Israel who are of Israel*, as St. Paul hath it; that is, the case is not the same with all men. For as St. Paul afterwards, *What then? Israel* Rom. 11. 7.  
*hath not obtained that which he seeketh for, but the election hath obtained it, and the rest were blinded.* It sufficiently answers the purpose of God, in giving his Law, and admonishing, and threatening, and promising thereupon, that it obtaineth its ends upon the election. For how many things else might we accuse God and Nature for sending us, when they do no good at all, that we can perceive, but rather mischiefs? As deluges of waters in a wet time; and in droughts, great showers of rain, emptying themselves into the Sea, or sandy deserts, from whence nothing springs answerable to such divine bounty? But we are taught, that God and Nature made things and ordained them in *their kind*, useful for the Universe, and never by a particular purpose, that every single act or part should have the same visible and proportionable effect, that the whole hath. And so in the dispensations of his spiritual Graces, it suffices to acquit and justify divine providence, that they have their due ends, though not the same that man may expect, who certainly would never have it rain (might he order matters and choose) but at such times, and in such places, as he thinks fit, and then, always. Again, It would go harder against this opinion, if so be that the only end why God published his Word, and gave his Laws, were to convert men, that they might be saved. This is indeed a principal, but not the only intent God hath, but the publication of Gods holiness, and justice, and righteousness, and mercy, and the like glorious attributes, in which publication God is much more known, admired, and glorified by wicked men, and reprobates, than otherwise, though they oppose and dislike the same, even against their own wills, giving such like glory to God on earth, as they shall in Hell hereafter: And we know, that no accession of real good being possible to be made to God, the outward manifestation is of principal concernment. Last of all, Could there be an infallible discriminating note, made between the incorrigible reprobates destined to destruction, and the corrigible offender ordained to life, then



Ezek. 3. 4.  
7.

then indeed much more colour would appear, to justify the refusal of dispensing the means of salvation to such, and the denial in the reprobate, to give ear to such offers; but flesh and blood cannot reveal this to us, and the Spirit of God hath not. Doth not God send his Prophet *Ezekiel*, with exprefs commission to warn the house of *Israel*, though he exprefly assures him, *They will not hearken unto thee, for they will not hearken unto me*. If the child in the womb, being certainly determin'd to one sex long before it is brought forth, yet this certainty being hid from our eyes, (though but for such a small time) is thought by Parents a matter of prayer many times, that it may be a Son: How should not we much rather, take the just occasion of applying our selves to acts of Religion, though possibly the event with God is determined? The summe then of this Chapter comes to this: That God by his sovereign dominion, and by his inscrutable counsels, doth, out of the corrupted and forlorn mass of fallen man, elect whom he pleases, to effectual Grace, and from thence brings them to infallible Glory, but never without their own acts of embracing his offers, and persevering faithfully in his service. So that though he purely chooses them to the means of Grace, without consideration of their worth or fruitfulness, yet he never ordains any, or elects them to Glory, but upon an intuition of faith, and obedience to his will. And on the other side, he passes by others, leaving them in great part as he found them, from whence spring works of wickedness, freely invented and acted, and tending infallibly unto damnation. So that God doth not in like manner influence the wicked, as he doth the righteous, that is, for no other cause but his own will, taking occasion justly from that common deformity, wherein he finds them, but never simply destines any man to damnation, but upon beholding the deserts of their sins. But how it can come to pass, that God thus ordaining the end, damnation, should not also appoint the means, sin, without which he condemns no man, shall be answered in a more proper place. Here only I add, for their sakes, who measure opinions by famous Patrons, to which they are addicted, that as I have said nothing to comply with, or spitefully to oppose *Calvin* and his followers, so neither to cross *Arminius*: But this I must say, that though I look upon *Arminius* as a much more modest man, and more judicious Disputant than *Calvin*, in these deep points; yet in their followers, we shall easily see a great disparity, to the disadvantage of the Remonstrants: For very many of *Calvin's* followers have mitigated, and fairly interpreted his too harsh and scandalous expressions and opinions, and I think, none have gone beyond him. But on the other side, what *Arminius* with much modesty and gravity delivered erroneously, his abettors and followers have pursued and improved, many of them, to such an intollerable height, that they fall often into direct Pelagianism, and from thence, which is much worse, into Socinianism, as experience plainly sheweth.

*Beverovicius.*

And to that Dutch Physician, *Emperick* in this part of Divinity, who protested against all ministration of Physick to sick persons, unless he could be assured of a mutability in the term of his Patients life, (for I must openly profess the same reason of Gods Providence, and pre-determination to temporal life and death, as spiritual and eternal, and they are equally fixt, and moveable both of them) it suffices to answer, *Then he may let it alone*; and no absurdity follows. But because a very learned and grave Divine of ours, seemeth to have given some weight to the argument, by citing him to our present purpose, I answer further, That no such

such thing is said to be so precisely and simply decreed, but it is as necessary the means should be determined as the end: God hath determined no effect, but he hath determined the proper cause thereto conducing. And it is as false that God hath determined that such a man should recover his health, as that he shall do it without such proper means. The means coming under the decree as well as the end. It will be said, that this takes away all liberty from man, as well in the way, as to the end: And probably, *Beverovicus* if he had thought on this, though he had been assured that the term of mans life was moveable, but the means thereto unmoveable, would never have read book about physick, nor stir'd off his seat to any patient: because whatever he did, or not did, the means should have been applyed, and succeeded to the sick party. But because we are sure we cannot go out of our Island on foot, shall we not stir out of doors at all? Because we cannot do what we would, and go as far as we would, shall we not do any thing at all? Because our *Liberties* do not reach beyond Gods *Manner*, and priviledge the second cause from the authority and influence of the first, shall we be fullen and dogged, and refuse that which we have? Certainly, whatever plausible suggestions may of late have been instilled into the common peoples minds of a free subjection; it can never be rightly and honestly understood of a freedom from the Supream Power and Justice: And so, whatever liberty of will may be claimed to man in his actions, must be interpreted rather in relation to his fellow creatures, and subjects, and outward causes, which cannot impose upon his will; but the first cause may, in that connatural way we before mentioned: and in the next place shall have occasion offered, farther to explain.

## CHAP. XIII.

*The Occasion of treating of Sin here. What sin is. What Evil. Monstrosities in things natural, and Evil in Moral things illustrate each other. Sin no positive or real Thing. God the direct Cause of no Evil. St. Paul in his Epistle to the Romans makes nothing for the contra-Remonstrants literally and primarily taken.*

**T**H E near respect that Sin hath to what is passed, and the aspect it hath to what is before us, concerning the Providence of God in the Fall of Man from his native Righteousness, oblige us here to enquire farther into the nature of it. And slightly passing over that doubt of some Philosophers and Ancient Hereticks, How, if there were a God, who is supremely and infinitely good, and no more but one, Evil should find any being amongst the beautiful works of God, its nature being so foul, monstrous, and contrary to God? because it is touched above, and in truth do adde rather a greater beauty and lustre to God works than if no such thing were to be found, and because as the glory, so the power of God is much more manifested thereby, in that he curbs and checks its excess and exorbitancie, at his pleasure, and forces it by his providence to a good event in general, if not particular; we are now to satisfy our selves, What that we call Evil and Sin, is: And what relation God hath to it?

First then we are to note that *Evil* and *Sin* differ only as *Genus* and *Species*, so that all Sin is Evil, but all Evil is not Sin. Evil is that which is contrary to nature or natural Good. Sin is that which is contrary to grace and moral good. And that which is contrary to the order, rule, and form of Nature is called Monstrous; that which is contrary to the Rule of Justice and Holiness, is called *Sin*. And as monstrosity in nature is divided into defects and excesses: So Sin in morality is divided into Omissions and Commissions. And of neither of these can God be said to be the Authour; or Nature under him: For if Nature, according to Philosophers, which is but Gods Instrument, doth not intend monstrous effects, much less may God be said so to do, whose acts are alwayes more constant and steady, the higher they are, and nearer to himself. For (to give an instance) when we see a want of a limb in a monstrous birth, it may so far be imputed to Divine Providence, that it could not so happen without the knowledge and consent of the Supream Cause in whose power it was to have disposed outward and second causes to the effecting of a regular and perfect work: yet directly, and with a positive purpose to have assisted in the production of such a Monster, we cannot safely nor wisely say,



say, seeing the denial of that ordinary and more necessary concurrence to such an end is altogether sufficient to it: and such defects arise not from Gods positive Will to have them so, but from his not willing to have them otherwise.

There may seem somewhat more difficulty in Monsters in excess, when any Creatures have more parts than are naturally proper to them, as four hands, or three legs, and the like: But this proves not any direct intention to this, but only an intention not to keep things in their proper limits, and to their Rule. A Master or Father when he holds not a severe hand over his child or servant, cannot but by inference and consequence, be said to be the cause of the exorbitant carriages of them; because though he wills not to prevent such mischiefs, he doth not will they should be. God in like manner willetth redundance of matter, as a thing real and positive, but that it should meet together as to constitute such an unnatural effect, is rather the suspense and with-holding his Providence than the exercising of the same.

This I premise as leading to the due apprehension of Moral Evil: which to hold as such to have a positive Existence in the world, is inevitably to become Manichean, and to make God the Authour of sin: as St. *Austin* in these words declarèth. Here we are to be careful that we fall not into the Heresie of the *Manichees*, who said there was a certain *Nature of Evil*, and a certain people of darkness with their Princes: And afterward; So they erre, so they are blinded, so they make themselves the people [*Gentem Tenebrarum*] of darkness, by believing that which is false, against him who created them, for every Creature is good, but it is corrupted by the depraved will of Man. Thus he: and were it so that Evil had a positive being, from whom could it proceed but from God? And it is repugnant to the Nature of the good God to be the Author of any thing simply Evil, so far the *Manicheans* were in the right: therefore they that hold this, must with the *Manichees* invent and introduce another God. I know the modern defenders of the positive nature of sin alledge several Schoolmen and some Fathers, for the same: but I know there are more express testimonies of the Ancient against it, and the Modern of any account had either another sense than we now state the doubt in, or must be rejected with their Relater: It is not a place here to examine and encounter all: nor to alledge the Reasons or Authorities to the contrary, which might easily be done. Only that Argument taken from the distinction of Sins of Omission and Commission, deserves to be considered. For, say they, if Sins of Omission consist only in defect of duty, and are thereby distinguished from sins of Commission (which are such as not only fall short of what is due, but act the quite contrary, as when a man instead of praying, and praising God contumeliously abuses his Name and Worship) this hath more in it than a meer negation or privation of good. Thus indeed it seems, but thus it is not. For both these are evil upon the account of privation and the absence of good: the difference only is in this, that in sins of Omission, the privateness or negation is immediately seated in the Subject owing such an Act, and in such a manner; and here, in no Action at all, but the absence of it, which renders a man and denominates him immediately evil, or defective. But in sins of Commission, the case is far otherwise, for here the privation or defect relateth not immediately to the Subject, as the Man himself, but to the Action it self; and by that

Omne bonum  
viva substantia  
est, & vita est.  
Vita autem  
Christus. Omne  
autem malum  
sine substantia  
est, & nihil est  
— & tamen  
perdere potest.  
Opus Imperf.  
in Matth.  
Rom. 4.  
Στίγμις ἔστιν  
ἔξι πρὸς Ἀρι-  
στοτ. Phys.  
Οὐ γὰρ ἔχει  
φύσιν ἢ ποσὴν  
εἰς συνίσταται  
εἰ μὴ πρὸς  
ἐκτελέσειαν ἢ  
ἢ ἀρετῆς.  
Chrysost. Ho-  
mil. 2. in Act.  
Apost.  
Anselmus de  
Casu Diaboli.  
Tom. 3.

Pana Damni,  
and Pana Sen-  
sus,

is the Man made guilty, and evil: because though the act be in its nature positive, yet is defective as to its circumstances; according to which it ought to be performed. For when God hath appointed, and Justice and Reason directeth that a man should observe in his action such a time and season, and such a place, and have respect to such a person, such a manner, and measure; and he neglecteth all, or any of these, doth he not plainly offend in the negative, though the act it self be in nature positive? But in the case we are about, the Nature (as we said) of things is not to be valued, but the Morality: and the Morality may be evil, when the Nature is good: and the Morality may be privative, when the Act is positive. Hatred of God is an act of Man, than which none can be instanced in, to contain more evil or malice. Therefore as this is an act Natural and Vital, it is good, and hath God for its direct and first cause; but as this act is directed to God, and so relates to a wrong object, so it is evil, and hath neither countenance nor concurrence from him. For as is above-touched, we are to distinguish the Act of Sin, from the Sin of the Act: and that upon the received Maxime amongst the Philosophers, *That all Evil is in somewhat that is Good*: for having no subsistence of it self, it must rest upon some other thing that hath a real being; as a ruinous and crased house resteth upon a sound foundation. And it is distinguished from it, as the matter from the form: for though evil hath no such proper matter as other real Beings have (for if it had, it should it self also be real in nature, and of it self,) yet hath it somewhat proportionable and answerable thereunto, in that it affecteth such a Person immediately, as sins of omission or such an act as proceedeth from him: whereupon Aristotle saith well in a certain place, *Privation is a certain habit*, though taken properly nothing is more contrary to *habit* than *Privation*, whose nature it is to be the absence and want of Habit: and nothing by that Philosopher opposed more to *habit* than *Privation*.

I might here set down the opinions and testimonies of diverse Philosophers and Fathers expressly declaring against the positive nature of sin: but I shall rather compose the disputation, by giving *Anselmus* judgment of the case, than whom none have disputed the matter more acutely, of his Age. In his eleventh Chapter of his Dialogue concerning the fall of the Devil, he asks, *How Nothing and Evil should signifie any thing; whereas Evil is altogether Privative*: and there he answers, *Although Evil and Nihil signifieth something; yet that which is signified, is not Evil or Nothing; but some other manner whereby they signifie something. And that which is signified is somewhat, but yet not really somewhat, but, as it were somewhat. Many things are spoken after a certain form, which are not in very deed. And to fear, according to the form of the word, doth signifie somewhat Active, whereas it is Passive according to the thing it self. And so Blindness, &c.* And afterward in the 26th Chapter of that Treatise he speaketh thus; *Evil which is called unrighteousness is alwayes, Nothing: But Evil which is Incommodiousness, sometimes without doubt, is Nothing, as Blindness.* Aliquando est aliquid, *Sometimes is something, as Sadness and Pain.* And Chapter the 27th; He gives the general reason why Evil cannot be Any thing, viz. Because if it were any thing, it must be of God. Thus he: who we see distinguisheth Evil, first into that of sin, and that of punishment, or *Incommoditas*, as he calls it. And that of punishment he again distinguisheth into merely *Privative*, as blindness: and *Positive*, which is in suffering pains: which is the same with the common distinction of Punishment of *damage or loss*, and punishment of sense so well known in the Schools:

And

And we may easily yield that all Evil of Punishment is positive, though it be not, and yet retain our opinion, which runs only upon the Evil of Sin. I know *Augustine*, than whom it is well known no man speaks more expressly for the privative nature of all Sin, and *Thomas* and *Cajetane*, and others are alledged to have asserted a real Being of Concupiscence in man, which undoubtedly is Sin. But they may be interpreted, according to our former ground, where we allowed all sins to have a subject in which they are, and when this subject is somewhat active and positive, as such acts of Original Concupiscence are, and of our other Passions and Affections, then is the Evil of them taking its denominations from its matter to which it relates, said to be positive, for distinction sake, from those sins we call Sins of Omission.

From these grounds laid we may now adventure farther into the causality God may be said to have in reference to the Evil of Sin, for as to that of Punishment, the difficulty is not great. There are two Parties in the Roman Church which go contrary ways, making two several Propositions which joyned together do make God directly the Authour of Sin. So that a man may with better Reason make it a reason against communion with the Roman Church, than Companion against the Reformed, one of whose ten Reasons against the Reformed, that they made God the Authour of sin: For this, by the confession of some of the Romanists must follow. For the Dominicans do directly profess, That God doth concur to the act of Evil, and with the Will not only determined by it self, but determining it self to an evil. On the contrary, The Jesuits affirm that God awaiting and expecting the inclination and self-determination of the will, doth not concur to the very act of sin, but follows that motion which is evil: adding, and professing as in particular doth *Suarez*, That if God should first, according to nature, move and apply the will to an act which is sin, before it had determined it self, He should then in very deed be the Authour of sin: This we make the major Proposition. The Assumption is made by the Dominicans, who constantly affirm, That God doth concur to a sinful act: as doth *Medina*. Therefore by these two joyned together, God should be the Author of Sin. Nay *Medina* goes farther, and of himself will do the work before he is aware. He denies, I grant, that God is the Authour of Sin: and so will *Calvine*, and *Beza*, and *Zwinglius*, and such others, who are so warmly charged by their Enemies with that pernicious Errour: But he by consequence (and they do no more) doth thus plainly inerr so much, in the place cited, saying, When God is the cause of any act, he is also the Cause of the Privation which naturally follows upon that Act. But yet (saith he) concurrereth not to the deformity of sin. Here is a mystery, if any man could find it out. The deformity of Sin consisteth only in the privation of the act, or, which is the very same, want of conformity to the Rule of Actions, and the will of God: And yet it is here said, That God may be the Author of the Act, and the Author of the Privation that is found in that act, which Privation is nothing else but a want of due conformity, and yet not the Author of the deformity of that Act. This is a contradiction.

The true and simple account then of this matter may be this, That God is never any direct cause of Privations or Deformity of any Act, though he be the true Cause of the Act it self. And his *not willing* to prevent by his effectual concurrence, such an Evil in the Act, is all can be imputed unto him, and that is far from being the Cause of sin: unless it could be proved that there lay an obligation any time upon God, as many times there does upon man.

*Suarez in Thom. 22da. Disputat. 6. Tract. 4.*

*Medina in Thom. Quest. 79. Art. 2.*



man, That he should exert his Divine power to the utmost, for the preventing all the mischiefs he can; and hindring sin.

Rom. 9. 20, 21.

And here if querulous man (as 'tis often seen) doth repiningly reply upon God for hard dealing towards him, in that he punishes him for that sin which he foresees cannot be avoided by him, Gods grace withdrawing it self from him: St. *Paul* commands him silence, whether he understands the reason or equity of it or not: saying, *Nay, but O man, What art thou that repliest against God? Shall the thing formed say to him that formed it, Why hast thou made me thus? Hath not the Potter power over the clay, of the same lump to make one vessel unto honour, and another unto dishonour?* No man that acknowledges (and every Christian must acknowledge) the like, and greater power and prerogative in God over Man, than the Potter hath of his clay; can deny that God may order the work of his hands, as he pleases: neither can he deny but the drift of the Apostle in this comparison was to show the absolute power and dominion of God over all Creatures: and therefore let them see how they aggravate matters of this nature, and multiply fond ratiocinations, which they cannot but know agree not with St. *Pauls* stating and decision of this Question.

I do freely grant the adverse Party, that St. *Paul* doth not at all concern himself with that kind of Predestination, Election, or Vocation, as very many confidently presume he doth, in his Eighth and Ninth Chapters to the *Romans*: I mean, not particular or personal *Præ*-determination, and the like: the whole letter and the occasion of his discourse there, being concerning the Election of the Gentile Church, and the uncessant protection thereof, against all threatnings and Oppositions, and disputing the equity of Gods deserting the Jewish Church: yet thus far his argument, being general, holds good in particular persons; that if it be free to God, without any just exceptions, to choose and leave a Church or Nation at his pleasure; and according to the counsel of his own will, it is also reasonable and just for him, to favour, or show disfavour to any single person in like acts of his Providence; without being called in question for what he doth, or not doth.

## CHAP. XIV.

*Of Sin more particularly. And first of the Fall of Adam. Of Original sin wherein it consisteth: and how it is traduced from Father to children. The Proofs of it. The Nature and Evils of it: And that it is cured in baptism. That Natural Concupiscence bath not the Nature of Sin after baptism.*

**B**Y what is said, competent satisfaction may be had in that mystery of Gods Providence, in the fall, and sin of the first Man created (as we have shewed) in such perfection of natural Faculties, and divine Grace: the reason absolute and demonstrative whereof, cannot be rendred by the wit of Man; viz. Why God should make such a fine and exquisite piece, and deliver it over presently to ruin and loss. It may suffice, that God was not the direct cause of such his Fall, by impelling him, though his Free-will embracing the Temptation, he was privy to his errour. As it was in that memorable case of the death of *Benhadad* King of *Syria*, in the second of the *Kings*, when *Hazael* was sent to enquire, *Whether he should recover of that Sicknes*; The Prophet *Elijah* answered, *Go say unto him, thou mayest certainly recover: how be it, the Lord hath shewed me; that he shall surely dye*: And this was the true case of Adam; whom God knew to have full power certainly to stand, and yet he knew he would surely fall. As therefore God in that case, spake after the method and manner of mans apprehension, so he here acted. In that he first said the King might surely recover, and this was according to the common order of natural Causes, which then were upon him in his sickness: which were such as were easily resisted, and like to have no such effect: But then God withal beholding that which was not seen of man (perhaps not thought on by the Actor himself, at that time) he saw withal a necessary dependencie and connexion between another cause, and that effect which followed; and so declared surely, the contrary to the other. In like manner, God beholding *Adam* in that integrity and vigour of gifts and Graces with which he had furnished him, saw him in a certain condition to persevere in that state; but seeing withal the future outward cause of Temptation, he might well see the effect, what it would be infallibly. So that, when we say, a thing is contingent, we cannot say so in respect of all causes, but in respect of some special cause, to which, in our opinion and observation, such an effect may seem properly to belong. For it is a true Axiome amongst Logicians, *All causes accidental, are reducible to proper and direct causes*. So that there was no necessity, by Gods appointment, of *Adams* Fall, as he was framed of God, but somewhat might occur outwardly, which by  
Gods

2 Kings 8. 10.

2 Kings 8. 15.

Gods permission, might have as certain effect upon the will of Man, though Free of it self and indifferent, as had the wet cloath laid by *Hazael* upon the face of *Benhadad*, this only excepted, That what natures simple Act did in this, the will of man combining freely against himself, with those outward causes, suffered in that.

The thing therefore principally to be here enquired after, is rather about the Nature of this Sin in *Adam*, and the Effects thereof. And as to the former, it is to be observed, That what was in him an Actual sin, became in us an Original; and what was free to him to be subject to it, or void of it, becomes necessary to us, and inevitable. It might be called in some sense an Original sin in him; as it was the first in nature and time, he stood guilty of; but not as if his Nature was from the beginning so corrupt, as to dispose him unto it. Again, in him, it was of it self purely sinful, and a transgression of Gods Law, upon which followed evil effects; but in us, it seems to partake originally of both sin and punishment: but chiefly of this latter. For though they speak truly, in the larger sense, who make three things proper and inseparable from Sin, *Guilt*, *Stain*, and *Punishment*, yet restraining our selves to the true Notion of it; there are these two things only essential to it. The matter it self which is the evil act committed against the Law of God; or which commeth to the same, omitted contrary to the same: And the manner, or formality of it, which consisteth in the perverseness and pravity of the will, which is so essential to it, that it both distinguishes the errors of rational men from them of beasts and mad-men, and them of the same Man, from one another: so that what was done voluntarily and freely, differs wholly from that done with incogitance, so not affected (for then the will concurs with it and infects it) and without any intention so to do, as to point of moral Goodness or Evil. And according to the bent or averseness of the will to evil, commonly are estimated the degrees of evil. But though in *Adam* all these things concurred to the heightening of his Actual sin, yet in those that inherit that evil from him, the sin must needs be much less in Nature, and lighter; because of no personal concurrence to such deformity. Yet not so neither, but that it justly is denominated Sin, from the very nature and effects of it. For seeing whatever is in the Will, must be good or evil, and if the Will be found crooked, perverse, or averse to that it ought to incline to, this is contrary to Gods institution and Law, and whence ever this proceeds, from an immediate act of our own, or by tradition from others, seeing it is found in the Will, it must needs be contrary and consequently odious to God, and in conclusion sinful.

Again, as the fountain poisons and corrupts all streams flowing from thence, so the Will being thus corrupt, and naturally thus ill inclined, all the other defects, even in his body as well as soul, contracted by this fall, are as so many deformities in man, which render him deservedly hated of God; seeing such disparity and unlikeness to the worse, to that which he first fram'd. Thirdly, Original sin in Man hath this more of disorder in it, that it not only is a corruption of the will, and thereby a deformity and vitiosity in the inferiour parts and faculties, but it is of ill consequence. For if this depravation went no farther than that evil born with us, if it stand there, and wrought no more evil, the nature of it had been less sinful, and more tolerable; but being of an active nature, and having taken up the chiefest room in the soul of Man, it disposeth and impelleth to more mischief, in actual transgressions. As a Garrison held by a Rebel doth



doth not only offend Sacred Majesty by standing out against him it self, but when it finds it self strong enough, and hath opportunity, sallies out and makes invasion upon its proper Sovereign, and offers actual and active violence against him: So by this Original Evil first possessing the Soul, doth Concupiscence stir, and act by outward practises, contrary to the Law and Will of God. And therefore when St. *Austin* saith, alledged by the corrupters of this Doctrine of Original Corruption, They are born not *properly* but *originally* evil; he no wayes contradicts his own Doctrine, whereby he most of all farther explained and maintained this Original sin, being the first that gave the name *Original* to that Pravity in man. For true it is, that that only is called properly *Original Sin*, which *Adam* and *Eve* in person committed, and were not subject to by nature, as their Posterity are: because it was the first, in respect of mankind, as well in order of time, as nature and causality. Again, though this be traduced unto us his Off-spring, and be the cause and fountain of all other sins actually committed afterward, and for the same causes may rightly be called *Original*: yet considering that this Evil thus vitiating our nature, had no consent of our personal will, we neither understood it, nor any wayes affected it, it cannot be so properly called sin, as others which we act knowingly and willingly our selves: For nothing is in strict way a sin which we do not consent unto in some manner, either immediately, or in its remoter causes. And this doth yet farther appear, because no man is bound to repent properly of Original sin: Proper Repentance being an Act contrarying and reversing, so far as in us lyes, some evil by us done, and not suffered involuntarily: But Original sin is rather suffered than acted by the children of *Adam*. Yet though in the severest sense, we cannot be said to repent of Original sin, we are bound to exercise some Act of Repentance for the same: As grief, and sorrow of mind and heart for the evil we lye under, Confession and Recognition of our sad state before God, Imploration of his mercie and favour, to remove the same from us, and restore us to our pristine innocencie and integrity. For this, those many places of Scripture describing this Evil, do seem to require at our hand.

And no where doth the Scripture more fully declare this unto us, than in the Fifth Chapter of the Epistle to the *Romans*; which because *Socinus*, and such as plough with his Heifer, and are tickled with his pretty phantasies in eluding the Apostles meaning, and the constant interpretation of the most Ancient and Modern Expositours, we shall more particularly consider. It is undeniable, that St. *Paul* Rom. 5. amplifying the Grace of God and benefits unto mankind, even the Gentiles, by Christ Jesus, doth there make a comparison from the Twelfth verse to the end of the Chapter, of the first and second *Adam*: and of the Evil we sustained by the first Man, *Adam*; and the benefits we receive by the second Man, Christ. To this he supposes the ground of his Comparison; which is this, that *By one man Sin entred into the world, and death by Sin; and so death passed v. 12. upon all men, for that all have sinned.* This is made no more of than that *Adam* being the first Man in the world, and sinning, Sin must needs enter first into the world by him, if he sinned first; and that death followed upon that sin of *Adam*: But if this be all, how come the effects to exceed the cause, and

death to extend farther than sin? For it is not only said, that death entred into the world, in seizing upon that single Malefactor, *Adam*: but *So* death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned: where two things are to be noted. First, the note of dependance and consequence, *So*. For if *St. Paul* had meant that *Adam*, by himself and only for himself, introduced death, wherefore serves the term *So*, which is a certain indication of the manner how death came into the world, upon all persons: and as much as if it had been said, *Adam* first sinning, and bringing death into the world, so it was, that this death fell upon all men, for that all have sinned. Now, it is certain that all that dye have not sinned personally: and therefore Secondly, the Note *So* must also relate to the Cause of that death, which was sin: and is as much as, *Adam* sinning his Posterity also sinned, and became obnoxious to death. For to say as some eminently learned, and useful otherwise in their Doctrine of Repentance, *Death passed upon all*, i. e. say they, *Upon all the whole world, who were drowned in the flood of Divine vengeance: and who did sin after the similitude of Adam*: is as much as if another Scholiast like him had said, That is, upon all *Senacheribs* Armies before *Jerusalem* in the dayes of *Hezekiah*, or, Upon all the *Romans* in the battle of *Canna* with *Hannibal*. For it is certain that all men dye, and it is no less certain that all men without exception died not in the flood. And therefore what is added upon these words, *In as much as all have sinned*, that by them is meant, *All have sinned upon their own account*: we have already shown, that it is not absolutely true, and therefore cannot be *St. Pauls* meaning: For all that dye have not, as did *Adam*, or following *Adams* example, sinned: Infants dying prove the contrary. Yet I cannot deny but  $\epsilon\upsilon\ \delta\epsilon$  may have another signification, than is given by some, who would have it as much as  $\epsilon\upsilon\ \delta\epsilon$ , in whom, and not as our Translation hath it faithfully, *In as much*. This the Apostles doctrine is confirmed by what follows. For

v. 13, 14. *until the Law, sin was in the world; but sin is not imputed when there is no Law. Nevertheless, sin reigning from Adam to Moses, even over them that had not sinned after the similitude of Adams transgression.* These words, as by very many, and in diverse manners, so by the same hand are thus hal'd to this erroneous construction. *St. Paul* does not speak of all mankind, as if the Evil occasioned by *Adams* sin did descend for ever upon that account, but it had a limited effect, and reached only to those who were in the interval between *Adam* and *Moses*. But the more exact and literal enquiry into the Apostles meaning, will quite overthrow this presumptuous conjecture, which is occasioned from a mis-translation or mis-understanding of the words  $\alpha\chi\epsilon\iota$  and  $\mu\acute{\iota}\chi\epsilon\iota$ ; both which signifying the same thing, i. e. *Until*, are thought to be intended exclusively of the time to come, when they, as the like, do but intend such a term signally, as a most considerable Period, and not as the ultimate they drive at. As 'tis commonly understood of *Josephs* not knowing *Mary* until she had brought forth her first-born. And this will be evident to him that compareth the use of those words in the thirteenth and fourteenth verses, and the drift of the Apostle: which plainly to discover, will satisfy any doubter, and answer all objections, and other glosses. It is this, here (as generally) to lay before the Jewes (to whom *St. Paul* principally designs his discourse) the imperfection of that Law, which was by *Moses* delivered unto them, and upon which they so confidently rest, that neither the Law of God written in mens hearts

hearts before *Moses*, nor the Law then lately delivered by Christ was of any account with them; but *Moses* his Law must carry it from all: Justification must be by that, and the Vertue of the *Messias* himself depended on that. So that, in effect, they thought nothing sin but what transgressed the Law of *Moses*. *St. Paul* argues against this, saying, *For until the Law sin was in the world: but sin is not imputed when there is no Law:* which is as much as to have said, Ye ought not so much to stand upon your Mosaical Law: For that is not the only judge, or tryal of sin; seeing sin was *in the world until the Law*, that is, all the time from *Adam* to your Law; but *sin is not imputed when there is no Law:* but sin was imputed, and punished too. For (v. 14.) *death reigned from Adam to Moses*. Now if there was such punishment as death, then surely there must be a Transgression, and if there be such a Transgression, there must be also a Law, which is so transgressed: And therefore if such a Law, then surely *Moses* his Law was not that only Law, nor most ancient. Now (to draw nearer to our present Case) on whom fell this punishment of death? the Apostle answers, *On all*, without exception, *Even on them* (which could only be doubted of) *that had not sinned after the similitude of Adams transgression*. What is meant by this? That is, faith our Authour, *Who sinned not so capitally. For to sin like Adam is used as a tragical and high expression*, Hof. 6. 7. *They like men have sinned, in the Hebrew it is, Like Adam*. Of this I grant thus much, That *Adams* sin was the greatest that ever was committed since, all things duly weighed, and therefore it may well stand for a most heinous sin: and therefore *Job* likewise faith, by way of abhorrence and purgation, *If I covered my sin as Adam: One main circumstance aggravating Adams sin was, that he would have hid it, as himself, out of Godseyes, and defended himself, when he was convinced; but how he repented the Scripture is silent. But that the degree of sin cannot be the ground of comparison, but the very nature of sin, and kind, is plain from the subject thus punished by death. For had they been only men of years, who could choose the good, and refuse the evil, then indeed less might have been objected against that interpretation: but it being manifest that death reigned over Infants also who committed no sin, as did Adam, therefore another sense must be found, which answers the full intent of the Apostles argument, and it can be no other than this, That by similitude here he means, the like in nature, and not only in degree: For Infants, who are punished with death, have not sinned as did Adam: Adams sin was a sin properly so called, and Actual: but Children, who dye, sin not so, but are subject to that we call Original sin: which being such a corruption as defaceth the Image of God, and as it were clips his Royal Coyn, and allayes it with baser metall than he ordained man to consist of, may cause him justly to be rejected. Nay, which is much more, and granted (surely unadvisedly, as inconsistently with the principles of this Authour) the guilt of Adams Actual sin, as in himself, was such, that it descended to the sons of him before the Flood: For sayes he, *They indeed in rigour did themselves deserve it, but if it had not been for that provocation by Adam, they who sinned not so bad, and had not been so severely and expressly threatened, had not suffered so severely*. This is more than what the strictest defenders of Original sin dare affirm: viz. That God should take an occasion of punishing one man for anothers fault, when he did in no manner partake of the sin. Surely, if nothing of the Offence had descended to the Posterity of *Adam*, nothing of the punishment should have touched them.*

Job 31 33.



Rom. 5. 18, 19.

Next to the comparison here made by the Apostle between acts of *Adam*, and the acts of *Christ*, and the effects and events of one and the other, is the comparison between the persons to whom these on both sides extended: and sheweth that the remedy by *Christ* was proportionable altogether to the mischief occasioned by *Adam*. For, saith the Apostle, *As by the offense of One, judgment came upon All men to condemnation, even so by the Righteousness of One, the free gift came upon All men unto justification of life. For as by one mans disobedience many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous.* There seems in these two verses to be some contrariety, in that, first it is said that *Judgment came upon all*, and the *Free gift upon all*: and yet afterward, there is a restriction unto many, and not all concerned in the sin. Therefore it is to be observed, That, in the first place the Apostle speaks of the state of Evil or Condemnation: in the next, of the state of Restitution and Justification: For as all persons were included in the Condemnation of *Adam*, so were all included in the Justification of *Christ*: But as of all them, only some, many were, through his disobedience, made Sinners: that is, became such sinners as not to return to actual Righteousness and Salvation, so by the obedience of *Christ*, not all who were called and chosen came to Life and Holiness, but many only were made Righteous actually, and not all. Or if we take the word *Sin* as he, of whom we speak, doth, not so much for the real inward vitiousness of the soul, but for any outward defect; and, which is yet more, for the Punishment of Sin (in which sense the Sacrifice for sin was called Sin in the Old Law: and *Christ* in the New Testament is said to be made Sin for us; that is, a Sacrifice for Sin) so that to be made sinners, should import as much as to be made lya- ble to the punishment of sin, the matter is the same.

Aug. Epist. 87.

Wisd. 2. 24.

John 8. 44.

Ephes. 2. 3.  
Psalm 51. 5.

But because this Authour not only inclines to the Opinion of *Pelagius*, and of *Socinus* after him, making the corruption of nature nothing, and therefore exempting Infants from any such natural infection as we here suppose, but uses the same evasion of Imitation of *Adams* sin, and not propagation, as the original of all Evil to us; therefore let us hear what *St. Austins* argument was against that Opinion. If (saies he) the Apostle spake of Sin by imitation, and not propagation, entering into the world, he could not have said that by one Man Sin entred into the world, but rather by the Devil: for he sinned before man: and as the Wiseman saith, Through envie of the Devil, came death into the world. And *Christ* tells us, how aptly the Devil may be said to propagate sin by imitation, as well as *Adam*, thus reprehending the Jews. Ye are of your Father the Devil; and the Lusts of your Father ye will do: he was a murderer from the beginning, and abode not in the truth; because there is no truth in him: when he speaketh a lye, he speaketh it of his own, for he is a liar, and the Father of it.

And when *St. Paul* saith, We were by nature the children of wrath as well as others: And the Psalmist, Behold, I was shapen in iniquity, and in Sin did my mother conceive me; that these places must be accounted hyperbolical, and not to have a proper sense, is the special evasion of Modern Wits, not comparable to Ancienter Judgments, more simply understanding them. I know a more colourable interpretation is made by others, who interpret Conceiving in sin as relating to the Parents, and not to the Children. But this is less probable than the ordinary and obvious sense, applying it to *David*. For though it may be probable enough that Parents may offend in acts of Procreation, and so the child may be said to be conceived

ceived by them in sin: yet *David* being at the speaking of these words in deepest repentance for his own sins, cannot be said to leave off that subject, and to confess the sins of others, and charge his parents with that which concerned him not. Again, when he says *He was shapen in iniquity*, nothing could he say more intimately to signify his proper state, at the time of his first conception.

But the Scriptures do not only barely say, we are originally thus infected and sinful, but, by the effects and certain other indications, declare the same. The first and chiefest of which may be Death, and punishments sticking close to infants at their birth, and even before they come into the world: Now the Law of God being unalterable, that punishment should follow, and not go before sin; it must be that somewhat of the nature of sin must prepare the way for such sufferings.

Secondly, That all men come to years of discretion are effected with Actual sin, few of the opposers of Original sin, deny; But according to Reason and Scripture both, the fountain being so infected and corrupted, whatever flows from it must, of necessity, partake of the same evil. For *who* (saith *Job*) *can bring a clean thing out of an unclean? not one.* And *St. James*: *Doth a fountain send forth at the same place, sweet water and bitter? Can a fig-tree, my brethren, bear olive-berries? either a vine, figs? so can no fountain yield both salt water and fresh.* From whence it follows, by way of just Analogy, That the Fountain being corrupt, there must be derived to the Rivolets the like unsoundness.

And thirdly, we see this by experience, that both bodily and mental infirmities and disorders, are traduced from Father to Son in actual Evils: as the Gout, Stone, and Leprosie are transmittit to posterity from the Father; and Anger, and other passions in like manner. It may as well be said That the Son hath the Gout, and halts by imitation, and not by propagation, as that such other affections, which are common to Father and Son, so proceed.

Fourthly, The Argument which *St. Augustine* could never, by the *Pelagians*, be answered, taken from Baptism. For this they could not deny, but the Church universally practised Pæda-baptism (that is held an opinion manifested in practise that Children were capable of that Sacrament, and received the benefit of it, however some particular persons deferred the same) and held it of use unto them, for the entering into the Kingdom of Heaven. Therefore surely there must be some impediment, and that impediment could be nothing but what hath the nature of sin in it; therefore they bring sin with them into the World. *Pelagius* had a good mind indeed (as *Austin* observed) to have denied the use of Baptism, but as bold as he and his great second *Julian of Capua* was, the general Judgment of the Church declared in the practise of it, put a stop to his inclinations: but *Socinus*, bolder than any Heretick before him, sticks at no such thing, but flatly denies the use of it to all but such as are converted newly to the Christian Faith, as in the times of the Apostles. This was freely and roundly invented and uttered; and which suffices alone to convince us of the former error, denying Original Sin, which was alwayes held a principal cause of Baptism.

Lastly, Thus much may be observed by natural Reason to the confirmation of Original Sin, which *Seneca* noted, but could give no reason of. *No man* (saith he) *is of a good mind, before he is of a bad one: we are all pre-vented.* And in the same place he saith, *No body is with difficulty reduced*

Job 14. 4.  
Jam. 3, 11, 12.  
Γίνονται γὰρ  
ἐκ φαλακρῶν,  
φαλακροὶ, καὶ  
ἐκ νεσίδων  
νεσιδῆες ὡς  
Ἰπποκράτης  
ἐβόλει, καὶ ὁ  
ἀληθὺς λό-  
γος καὶ ἀκο-  
λασία καὶ μὴ  
τὸ περιεμμενόν  
καὶ ἡσυχία,  
χρῆσθαι περὶ  
τοῦτον τὸ  
σπέρμα, καὶ  
ἐξ ἡμῶν, &c.  
Ance. Gazet  
Th. cybraeus  
Biblioth. P.P.  
pag. 392. To. 8.  
Non enim ex ex  
illis qui modo  
nova quedam  
gannire cape-  
runt, dicentes  
nullum reatum  
esse ex Adam  
tractum, qui  
per baptismum  
in infante sal-  
vatur. Aug. E-  
pist. 28. Hie-  
ronymo.  
Ad neminem  
ante bona mens  
venit, quam  
mala. Omnes  
preoccupati  
sumus. Sen. Ep.  
50. Nemo  
difficiliter ad  
naturam redu-  
citur nisi qui  
ab ea deficit.  
ibid.

to Nature, but he that hath made a defection from it. Now, supposing that God made all things perfect, and instituted the nature of man more inclinable to acts agreeable to that perfection, than to the contrary, whence can it come that contrariwise, Man naturally inclineth to that which is base, and unworthy, and is hardly taken off that corrupt way of acting contrary to reason and vertue, and reduced to a perfection becoming his Institution and End, but that the very principle of his nature is hurt, and the root corrupt? And because nothing can be Author of its own Principles, by which it subsists, no man can be said by his own act, to have corrupted them. Indeed we say, a Man is of corrupt Principles, when he hath contracted some evil habits disposing to wickedness, but that is accessorie, and not innate to him.

And if it be farther urged, That no man can be guilty by anothers fault, nor corrupted by anothers principle; it is answered as before, so long as it is only that others, and not his own in some degree: For as *Thomas* hath distinguished, *There is a Principle of Nature, and a Principle of a Person: and a Sin of Nature, and a Sin of a Person.* *Adam* had not only principles whereby he himself subsisted, but also was the principle of all his Successours. So that Original sin was as well the sin of the one as the other. So that from the depraved will of *Adam* as the first principle of all, came the corruption of the Will of all: Whereupon speaking strictly (as we have said) this Original sin is not properly sin in the Infant; but, a want of Original Justice seizing him, and exposing him to destruction: as *Thomas* and *Catharinus* also have taught: which two are the effects of the sin of *Adam*, upon himself and children: but the very formal Reason of sin in his Posterity.

For where, as some say, It is natural Concupiscence moving to Evil: and others, That it is the absence of Divine Justice and Grace, they differ rather in the niceties of speech, than in the matter it self. For to me it seems that the loss of Divine Perfection and Grace, superadded to the nature of Man, whereby he was abundantly able to secure himself and glorifie God in that state of happiness, most neerly expresses the nature of it, as in the sons of *Adam*. (For in *Adam* himself it was actual disobedience) but Concupiscence inordinate doth rather express the consequence of it: For upon that desolation in the soul of Man, quickly arose a disorder of the inferiour Affections, which by a general name is called *Concupiscence* or *Lust* by the Apostle, in his Seventh Chapter to the *Romans*. And *Natural* it is called, because, as out of the cursed ground sprang up briers, thorns, weeds and thistles, where more useful fruit of the earth was intended, so upon this curse of mans soul, Evil motions arose to the hurrying him to Actual sin, being themselves really sinful.

Again, it is observable, for the true resolution of the Question, That there is commonly an ambiguity in this term, *Concupiscence*; it being sometimes taken for the act, and exercise of that vicious principle in man fallen; and sometimes for the *Pravitie*, and degenerate temper of the soul, making it prone to actual sins. This latter is that which is properly called *Original Sin*; though more properly Original unholiness, or want of that instituted Integrity, with which man was at first endowed: and in it three things are to be considered; First, the privation of Supernatural Good. Secondly, Proneness to unnatural Evil, against God. Thirdly, Odioufness and Culpableness before God, who must needs be offended at the sight of so much deformity in his Creature, contrary to his first Institution



tution of it and Intention ; though this evil habitude should never break out into actual Rebellion against him, by the exercise, or putting it in execution, by actual Concupiscence, against the Law of God : St. James seemeth to justify this distinction, where he saith ; *Every man is tempted, when he is drawn away of his own lusts, and enticed* : This gives us the original Lust or Concupiscence, which inclineth and moves to sin, and to this is it to be imputed, that a man so easily is withdrawn from truth and righteousness, and noble acts becoming his high nature. He goeth on : *Then when Lust hath conceived, it bringeth forth Sin, &c.* that is, when the Radical Concupiscence, or Concupiscibility in man becomes impregnated and matured by outward opportunities and occasions of sinning, it bringeth forth into outward act, sin : and the event and consequence of this sin, is death. So that the innate Lust lurking in the Soul, and not actuated by outward occasions either inwardly to effect and desire, or outwardly to act sin, is not properly sin, but metonymically only ; either as it is the effect of *Adams* sin, or the cause of our sins, but it is properly odious to God, and exposing us to his heavy wrath, so far at least as is seen in the deprivation of that beatitude, to which man was at first designed. And this exactly agrees with the nature of that sin : For as that which was in *Adam* was actual disobedience, in his Posterity is only want of that perfection which was due to their nature : So *Adam* not only incurred the loss of that bliss he was capable of, and in the ready way to enjoy, but likewise the punishment of Sense, answerable to his Sin of Commission : and his Posterity was made subject to the punishment and loss of Gods favour, and that bliss they were, in *Adam*, once ordained unto. But when their Sins become Actual, they are subject to punishment of *Pain*, and torment for the same.

And by this, the way is well prepared to make answer to that common doubt concerning the effect of Baptism, and the state of the Regenerate, in reference to Original sin, and Concupiscence ; viz. whether Concupiscence remaining after Baptism in the Regenerate be sin or not. Scriptures are alledged with great colour on both sides. It is observed by Bishop *Davenant*, that St. *Paul* calls Original Concupiscence, sin in fourteen several places, in his sixth, seventh, and eighth Chapter to the *Romans* : which if so, Original sin it self must needs be oftner mentioned in Scripture than will be granted by many : For mine own particular, I see none of those places so exprest in the description of it, that *the law of Sin*, *the Body of Sin*, *the Law of the Members*, *the Lust of the Mind and Flesh*, and some other expressions to the same effect, may not be understood as well of an evil habit, and inveterate custome acquired of sinning, which is wont to give Law to the Reason and Mind of Man, as of Original sin we now speak of, contra-distinct to it, were it not that the stream of Ancient and Modern Interpreters hath given another sense, not with modesty to be opposed. Therefore, yielding those many places to be meant of Concupiscence natural, we are to distinguish, answerable to what is above-said, with the Bishop, between *Inhabiting Concupiscence* and *Actual Concupiscence* : And herein a little vary from him, if he doth mean that those places are to be applyed to Concupiscence resident only, and not actuated : But of this latter he seems to speak ; and no doubt so is St. *Paul* to be understood, and not of the other. And without all doubt, Concupiscence coming to act inwardly in the mind, by coveting only inordinately, or outwardly, by executing the evil purposes of the mind, are sin, even in the most

Jam. 1. 14. 15.

Davenant.  
De term. 1.Lex Peccati  
est violentia  
consuetudinis  
qua trahit, &  
tenetur etiam  
in vitia animus  
eo merito quo  
in eam volens  
illabatur, Aug.  
in Confess.  
Lib 3 c. 5.

Rom. 6 6.

Rom. 6. 3, 4.  
Colof. 2. 12.  
Gal. 3. 27.Aug. lib. 6. c. 5.  
in Julian.

Pfal. 32. 1, 2.

1 Cor. 6. 11.

Hebr. 9. 26.

2 Pet. 2. 20.

most Regenerate. And when this becomes a habit, then it is called by St. Paul to the Romans, *The Old Man*, and *the Body of Sin*. But when the remains of that inhabiting Concupiscence, which only can be properly called *Original*, never come (after the death and burial with Christ in baptism, as the Apostle speaks often) to recover new life and motions, by conceiving new warmth from outward temptations (as in Infants dying before they come to be actual sinners, and in those of riper years immediately after their baptism) it cannot properly be said to be sin, or to expose to damnation, as all sin properly so called, doth. St. Austin quoted by that learned Bishop, plainly affirmeth thus much; saying, *Tale & tantum malum, and such and-so great Evil* [as that Original] *only because it is in a man, would oblige us to death, and drag us to the last death, but that its chain was broken in baptism.* All this we subscribe to, and do profess that the hold Original sin had over us, is loosed by Baptism. Yet we profess with Thomas also quoted, that when ever such Concupiscence comes into the Will, be it of Regenerate or Unregenerate, it puts on the nature of sin. But we suppose the remains of that Original Evil to contain themselves, where Baptism left them; and not to proceed farther. For this God certainly hates, (I mean progress of Concupiscence) and as it is well argued, God cannot hate any thing but sin. But after Regeneration by Baptism, or restauration to the vertue and power of Baptism, and the benefit thereof, by Repentance; the Sin in kind, as Lust, Envie, Murder, Malice is odious unto God, but as it relates to the Person once guilty of it, it is no longer odious unto God: why? because it is covered, it is pardoned, it is not imputed, it is as if it had not been. For otherwise, it could not be said, *Blessed is the man whose transgression is forgiven, whose sin is covered. Blessed is the man unto whom the Lord imputeth not iniquity, and in whose spirit there is no guile.* But St. Paul to the *Corinthians* having recited those notorious sins unto which unmortified and unregenerate men were subject and guilty of, adds; *And such were some of you: but ye are washed, but ye are sanctified, but ye are justified, in the name of the Lord Jesus, and by the Spirit of his Grace.* Meaning, that upon their conversion unto Christ, their washing in Baptism, their having received the Holy Ghost, they were acquitted from their former sins, and judged innocent and pure before him. And the Author to the *Hebrews* tells us how Christ, as an High Priest, once in the end of the world hath appeared to put away sin, by the Sacrifice of himself. And to what end should any man multiply Texts to prove this, to them, who will affirm that all sin is damnable, and grant that the Regenerate are not in a state of Damnation? then surely they are not properly sinners or guilty. I speak of the state of Remission and Absolution, and as such, as all Infants baptised are: And the grown Christian, because he may, and is most prone to incur new sins, after such absolution and purgation, is not therefore to be said, not to have been truly freed from the guilt of sin passed before his baptism, and thorow repentance. For that this may happen, experience and the testimony of St. Peter witnesseth, *For if after they have escaped the pollutions of the world through the knowledge of the Lord Jesus Christ, they are again entangled therein and overcome; the latter end is worse with them than the beginning.*

And what do they but in effect come off from their opinion of sinfulness in that Concupiscibility, rather than Concupiscence in the Regenerate, who after all, plainly grant that there is no guilt remaining in it, of it self, and thus answer the argument, which proveth that it is no such sin as they hold,

hold, because, *Original sin is the death of the soul, and makes a man an enemy to God: but Concupiscence in the Regenerate doth not this; thus: Original sin doth not cause spiritual death, but only as it is linked with guilt; but pardon being obtained in Baptism, the guilt is taken away, and makes not any man liable to wrath, but as he is found in the old Adam: so soon as a man is of the number of the Regenerate, he is found in the new Adam, i. e. in Christ.* Now would it be known, how any thing of the true nature of sin, may be separated from guilt: which is too hard for me to apprehend; they being so intimately coupled together, and convertible; that, as there cannot be conceived any guilt without sin, so neither any sin without guilt. And if they say, the guilt is done away in Baptism or Repentance, I will say, the sin is done away too, and maintain it. If they had distinguished between the effects and fruits of Original sin, and the sin it self, the matter had been much plainer and easier: and by their manner of proceeding in this Question, it should seem they only drive at this. For I grant what they allow, that Baptism doth not free from all corruption of Original sin, such as are blindness of the Mind, and debility of the Will, to embrace good entirely, and infirmities of the body, which by a Metonymie are called sin sometimes: but the *guilt*, it must necessarily, or do nothing at all; but what *Calvine* and *Perkins* and *Cartwright*, and many dancing after their Pipe (to the scandal of the Sacraments and the Reformation) admit us into the outward communion of the Church, and signifie the pardon of our sins from all eternity, without including Baptism or Repentance, which is made no more then a sign too. I conclude this point with that sentence of *St. Augustine* against them; who, by their own confession doth expressly affirm, That that clause in the Lords Prayer, *Forgive us our trespasses or doubts*, used by the Regenerate in Baptism, doth not concern the inhabiting Concupiscence, but the sins committed after Baptism. Which agrees with what we delivered before, that, though we may give, and lament for the misery of damned nature in us, by our fall in *Adam*; yet we are not bound to pray for the remission of it, after our regeneration. It may be inserted into our confession, as a part of our misery, thereby to move God to a more full restitution of the loss sustained, but not as to the obtaining of forgiveness of the guilt. It may serve for our humiliation and aspiration to a fuller delivery from the infelicity we are under, by the remains of it, not from the guilt of it, which is the sinfulness, wholly extinguished by those waters.

For as it is with a son to whom his father hath committed a greater measure of wealth, of money and rich cloathing than he could well expect, during his minority, which money and rayment he hath in riotous living & wretched company, lost and imbezelled; though he returns so far into the favour of his father, as to have his offence pardoned, and is taken into his family, and hath the promise of being heir of his Estate, notwithstanding his former miscarriages, yet hath not at present the like affluence and ornaments restored to him as he was once possessed of: So God dealeth ordinarily with his children, made such by Baptism, the crime is remitted to them, which they were guilty of, they are accepted into his favour, and become part of his holy family, the Church; they are assured of the future inheritance in Heaven. Yet doth not God thereby presently restore all that in *Adam* was prodigally lost by them, and mis-spent; but ordains that they should, by their future good and dutiful behaviour, and his ordinary allowance of Grace given them, *Occupie*

T t

until

*Neque enim ea nobis volumus, quæ dimissa non dubitamus in baptismo, sed illa utiq; quæ humana fragilitate: quamvis parva tamen, crebra subrepunt. Aug. Ep. 108.*



until he comes, and by daily improvement in Grace, arrive at last, by little and little, to the perfect consummation in Glory. After Baptism, therefore, there is that *Lucrum cessans*, as they call it, that want of benefit which was once enjoyed fully and freely, and continues of the nature of punishment, after pardon sealed to us: But the *Damnum emergens*, or positive damage or evil doth cease: God forbearing further to vindicate himself than what naturally springs from the foresaid defects remaining in the Regenerate: and this too, not so much with an evil eye, as a good intention to his children, to reduce them nearer and nearer to him, by such exercises. And hereby I suppose is competently answered also that Scholastical doubt moved chiefly in reference to Actual sins, *viz.* Whether God doth properly punish his children for those sins which he hath pardoned unto them before. The Scripture, which is not wont to speak Logically, precisely, or Scholastically but popularly & familiarly, doth many times call that punishment from God. (because nothing can happen without his order and dispensation) which is rather to be imputed to the imperfect state of Regeneration in this life, and the unrestored integrity in man, than the unpardonedness of offences. And again, it declareth so full satisfaction made by Christ for the sins of the Penitent, and freeness of Gods Grace, that without calling in question the justification of a sinner, and the justice of God, no more can be exacted of the pardoned than what is paid. But, as is said, a son reconciled to his father may be fully forgiven and assured of the inheritance expected, yet through want of that plenty denied him, not good affection, may fall into many wants and troubles, which should not have touched him, had he at first persevered in his duty and felicity.

## CHAP.

## CHAP. XV.

*Of the Restitution of Man after sin. The Means and Motives thereunto. In what manner Christs Mediation was necessary to the reconciling of Man to God. Socinus his Opinion of Christs Mediation refuted. That Christ truly and properly satisfied by his Death and Passion for us.*

**A**ND thus have we passed one great Period of Gods Divine Providence, in relation to the fall of Man: For (as hath been said) the Providence of God consisting of his *Power, Justice, Wisdom and Goodness*, is seen no less conspicuously in the due disposing of Evil to the general good of the Universe, as likewise to his Glory, than in dispensing of Good to his Creatures; though this latter affects us most. Now therefore we are to proceed to that Second most eminent Act of Gods more than Paternal Providence to Mankind, in his Restauration. And here we are to consider, first the Motives inducing God to such a benign acceptance of him to favour: Then the Means whereby this was accomplished.

And the former we may soon dispatch from what we before noted out of *Chrysostome*: that the first Original of Gods great design, and fountain of favour towards lost Man, did, and must needs spring from his own good will and inclination to Mercie, immediately; without any consideration whatever. For neither Mans misery, nor any of those many attempts of Schoolmen, Fathers, or Postillers to render a reason why God should be more inclined to favour Man than the lapsed Angels, can be of any tolerable account to incite or invite God to Mercy in this case; no, nor the consideration of Christ: For Christ was not the first reason which prevailed with God to have mercie, but his own natural Grace (as I may so speak) disposed him first in general, to the end: And the end, Mans restitution, being thus propounded and determined by himself, Christ was in order of causes, elected as a Mediatour and Means designed to bring to pass that end. And this the holy Scriptures affirm. *St. Peter* in his Sermon recorded in the *Acts*, thus speaks of him: *And he commanded us to preach unto the People, and to testifie, that it is he which was ordained of God, to be the Judge of quick and dead. To him give all the Prophets witness, that through his Name, whosoever believeth in him should receive remission of sins.*

Acts 10.42,43

Christ then is not the first Motive of Gods favourable Decree to Man; but Christ is the first Means whereby that Decree was executed and brought to effect. And this being granted and premised, the doubt concerning the absolute or hypothetical necessity of Christs becoming incarnate, and negotiating

Acts 4.12.

gotiating Mans salvation; that is, more plainly, Whether so necessary it was that Christ should appear a Mediatour between God and Man, as there were no possible salvation without it, or that only upon, or because God had so decreed it, that none should be saved but by Christ; may seem half ended. For it is out of question, that as the case now stands (as they speak, *in sensu composito*) God having determined that no other name under heaven be given whereby men must be saved, that there is no salvation in any other, but in Christ Jesus. But secluding that Decree, it doth not appear why God out of the Abyss of his Counsels, and Immenseness of his Wisdom, and absoluteness of his Free Grace, might not have compassed Mans salvation some other way. My Reason, besides those I find used by others, is that now intimated. If God could entertain such favourable thoughts towards Man as to decree his Salvation without intuition of Christ: surely, he might have effected it without Christ. For 'tis neither just nor reasonable to imagine that God could decree any thing absolutely, and not absolutely bring it to pass, for we cannot so judge of Gods Counsels, as we do of Mans; who alwayes determines with supposition of means, and ability to bring to pass what he determined: but all causes out of himself, being, without exception, subject to his will, nay his will needing no outward means to attain its purpose or resolution, it is sufficient argument that such a thing may be, that God without consideration of any means decrees it, and at his liberty chooses those means he pleases.

Col. I. 19, 20.

Luke 24 46.

2 Pet. 2.24.

Heb. 9.22, 23.

Neither upon this supposition is the advantage such as the Socinian Heretick expects to his cause. It is one of his pernicious heresies, That Christ satisfied not by his Passion, he expiated not the offense of Man thereby, but left him many a good lesson to direct and instruct him in the way to heaven; set him an excellent and fair example to follow: Makes now at last, being in heaven, (not before) intercession, and mediates for man: but his death was no satisfaction for the wrath of God conceived against the sinner. And to make way to this opinion, he says, that God might without any satisfaction, have freely remitted mans offence: and therefore it was not absolutely and indispensably requisite, that Christ should dye. If we should yield all this which is here taken for granted, which yet if it be not granted, is not so easie to be demonstrated; there appears no great advantage to their cause. For if it be assured unto us out of holy Writ, that God hath determined that no salvation should be attained, no recovery had without the mediation of Christ, and his satisfaction, what availeth it them that possibly it might have been otherwise? I confess the advantage to the other side would have been much greater, if it could be proved that Gods justice of absolute necessity, must have been satisfied by fulfilling the penal part of the Law: but however, there remains evidence enough from the conditional will of God, which, according to Scriptures, admits of no other way now. For so saith St. Paul to the Colossians, *It pleased the Father that in him should all fulness dwell: And (having made peace through the blood of his Cross) by him to reconcile all things unto himself, by him I say, whether they be things in heaven or things on earth.* And Christ himself in St. Luke saith, *Thus it is written, and thus it behoved Christ to suffer and to rise from the dead the third day: And that repentance and remission of sin should be preached in his Name among all Nations, beginning at Jerusalem.* And St. Peter; *Who his own self bare our sins in his own body on the tree, that we being dead unto sin, should live unto righteousness: by whose stripes we were healed.* And what can be more plain than that of the Epistle to the Hebrews; *Without shedding*



*shedding of blood is no remission.* And lest some may presume to restrain the Apostles words to the state of the Old Law, it is added, *It was therefore necessary that the patterns of things in the heavens should be purified with these, but the heavenly things themselves with better Sacrifices than these.* And what doth the Apostle mean by the better Sacrifices, but the Sacrifice of Christ upon the Cross? St. John declares so much expressly, where he saith, *If we walk in the light, as he is in the light, we have fellowship one with another, and the blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from all sin.* And in the fore-cited place of the *Hebrews*, more fully and expressly making a comparison between the expiations of the Law and Gospel, sayes thus: *For if the blood of Bulls and Goats, and the ashes of an Heifer sprinkling the unclean, sanctifieth to the purifying of the flesh; how much more shall the blood of Christ, who through the Eternal Spirit offered himself without spot to God, purge your conscience from dead works to serve the living God?* If therefore God under the Mosaical Law might have passed over the errors and uncleanness of his people Israel, but never would remit them without expiations and sacrifices to that end ordained; how can it be imagined, that the moral errors and impurities of the soul of Man by sin should be expiated or passed over without that Sacrifice and shedding of the blood of Christ appointed to that purpose? Surely therefore, a sense there is wherein it is impossible God should remit sins without due punishment for the same inflicted; and the least and lowest is that which we call conditional, supposing that God hath so decreed that no sin should be expiated but that way. A way, which, besides the excellent agreement it hath with the Justice of God, and Mercy also, is full of pregnant advices and instructions to the Offender, partly informing of the foul and mortal nature of sin, which cannot otherwise be pardoned than by such satisfaction of blood: partly by humbling him, and moving him to cry God mercy bitterly and heartily; and lastly, by possessing his mind with a dread and terrour of the nature of sin, so as to avoid the same for the time future.

1 John 1. 7.

Hebr. 9. 14.

## CHAP. XVI.

*Of the Nature and Person of the Mediatour between God and Man. In the beginning was the Word, proved to be spoken of Christ: and that he had a Being before he was Incarnate. The Union of two Natures in Christ explained. Christ a Mediatour by his Person, and by his Office, and this by his Sacrificing himself. The Scriptures proving this.*

**T**HUS far of the necessity and use of Mediation between God and Man, for the reconciling them at this great distance: Now it remains to speak more particularly of the Person or Mediatour himself, whom Christian Faith acknowledges to be *Christ Jesus*: who, as the Scripture tells us, *came unto the world to save sinners*, and to save them by his Mediation: And that this is a faithful saying, that is, a truth to be embraced by true Faith, without which there is no Salvation.

But of the Condition of this Mediatour we find no small differences amongst such who are called Christians. They are of three sorts. Some profess him to be God, but deny him to be true and real Man: Others believe him to be Man, but deny him to be God: But the Faith truly Christian professes both; *viz.* That Christ was God and Man. We shall remit (for brevities sake) the Reader to what hath been said before, proving the mystery of the Trinity out of the Scriptures, and that Christ the second Person in the Trinity is the Son of God by natural Generation, supernatural to us. And to prove the second out of the word, now there is scarce one such Heretick who denies it, may seem superfluous. That which is to be demonstrated, is, That there was time of union of that second Person in the Trinity with Man, and that this union was such that it constituted not two Persons, but one; as *St. Paul* plainly writeth to *Timothy*: *There is one God and one Mediatour between God and man, the Man Christ Jesus*. And therefore, whatever doctrine so speaks of this Mystery, as to divide the Natures into two Persons, as if there were two Mediatours, two Saviours, two Christs between God and Man, destroyeth the Faith of a Christian, no less than that doth which denies these two Natures to concur in one Person: the Eternal and Divine Nature and Person assuming, in the fulness of time, humane Nature inconfusedly into the Divine.

To the proving this, we take that as a sure ground and foundation which *St. John* hath laid to build his Gospel on: That there was an Eternal Divine Nature, *in, and from the beginning*, and that this Divine Nature was diversified by three distinct Persons: that one of these Persons is called the Word:  
for

Word: For he saith, *In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God.* Ridiculous are the violences offered to these words by Hereticks, who first take here *Beginning*, not for that highest (and higher than the Creatures comprehension can mount to) of all durations, which none is afore, and none come properly after, but for a term of time properly fixt; and for want of more remarkable, do pitch upon the first publication of the Gospel as that beginning; answerable (forsooth) unto that speech of *Moses*, *In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth*: but the agreement is too little to make such interpretation: because it is plain that heaven and earth not only had a beginning, but gave beginning to time it self, measured and observed by them. And it is plain, that the Gospel did not begin so soon by almost thirty years as Christ began, according to his humane nature. And if it be taken of the Person of Christ, What can be more absurd than to say, *In the beginning was the Word*? that is, Christ began when he began. Therefore the word here, can neither be taken for the Gospel, or Word preacht, but it must be meant of a word superiour and anteriour to both: as doth yet more plainly appear from the phrase used, *The Word was with God, and the Word was God*: For the heavens and earth which are said in *Genesis* to be made in the beginning, cannot be said either to have been with God, or to have been God: nor can the humane nature of Christ, not extant till some thousands of years after the first Creation be said to have been in the beginning with God: and much less to have been God: And the like may be said of the Word spoken by Christ and his Apostles: which the Scriptures do not reckon to have begun at Christs birth, nor many years after. For thus saith St. Peter in his Sermon to *Cornelius*, *That Word ye know which was published throughout all Judea, and began from Galilee, after the Baptism which John preached.* The Word therefore, according to this account, was not at the beginning, but after *Johns* Baptism. But this is not all, this is nothing in comparison of what is added, *The Word was God*: The humane nature of Christ precisely taken was not God: therefore another Word must be allowed to be God: And that must be the Word Eternal and Personal. And if this be doubted of, I thus argue from the words following. In that sense, that Christ is said to be Light, is he said to be the Word, but Christ is said to be Light, and the Light is said to be Christ, and St. John Baptists disavows that Light, and ascribes it to Christ. And therefore, as the Person of Christ is signified by the Light, so is it by Word. John 1. 1.  
Gen. 1. 1.  
Acts 10. 37.  
John 1. 7, 8, 9, 10.

And how can we possibly make sense of Christs words in St. John, if Christ præ-existed not, before he came into the World, in the flesh? *And now glorifie thou me, O Father, with that glory which I had with thee, before the foundation of the World.* It may be said, that before the foundation of the World, such decree of glory might be given to one future; but thus it cannot be said of him who is described to be actually possessed of it, before the foundation of the World: and that a man is said to be possessed of, which he is said to have had, as here. And how could Christ say truly, *Before Abraham was, I am*? when he was not Fifty years old, according to the Jews account? And that he puts a distinction between his coming from the Father, and his seeing the Father otherwise than any before him, or of his time, proves a præ-existence and presence singular with God. *Not any man hath seen the Father, save he which is of God, he hath seen the Father.* And to this, adde what follows: *What and if ye shall see the Son of Man ascend up where he was before?* Doth not this plainly imply, that as Christ John 18. 5.  
John 8. 57, 58:  
John 6. 46, 62.

Christ



Christ did really ascend after his Resurrection, and sat at the right hand of God in his humane nature; so he was there before, some way or other; and no way can be thought of but his Divine nature: as St. Paul intimated to the Ephesians, *He that descended is the same also that ascended up far above all heavens* —. Now if any will be so captious as to except against this, because the Divine Nature cannot properly be said to descend, because it filleth all things; it is true in rigour of speech, what they say, but not according to the form of speech frequent in Scripture: which then affirmeth God to descend, when, as in the case of *Sodom and Gomorrha*, he appeareth and revealeth himself more sensibly, as Christ did, taking humane nature on him.

And this præ-existent Nature of Christ to his humane being proved, that these were so united together, must be also shown. And to this, the single express testimony of St. John may suffice an equal mind. *The Word was made Flesh, and dwelt amongst us: And we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father.* And when St. Paul saith, that God sent his Son in the likeness of sinful Flesh, and for sin condemned sin in the Flesh; he implyeth that there were two terms considered in Christ, as in all other things sent. First, there is the Person by whom, or from whom the Party is sent; and that here was God. Secondly, there was the Party; or term to whom, and that was either to the World in general, or to that individual substance of Flesh so assumed by him; and which is here intended. Now it cannot be, that the Act of sending should be the same with making: but first a Thing is, before it is sent, and the term to which, must be distinct from that which is sent. Therefore Christ, according to the Phrase of holy Scriptures, being sent to take Flesh, must have, of necessity, a subsistence before; which subsistence must be of a Divine Nature: as is also witnessed in the Epistle to the Hebrews. *For as much then as children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself took part of the same.* That is, the person of Christ took part of the mass of humane Flesh and Nature, when he was formed of the substance of his Mother in her womb. And in that it follows, *Verily he took not on him the nature of Angels, but the seed of Abraham.* What can be more necessarily implied than a Person præ-existing, to whom (according to the nature of the thing) it was indifferent to have taken the nature of Angels, or the Flesh of man: and that it pleased God to send his Son to man; and it also pleased his Son to elect humane nature to dwell in: so that the manner of Christ thus consisting of two Natures, is matter of difficulty, rather than the thing itself; i. e. how two Natures can be, and how they were, and are actually united in Christ.

*Suidas* observes ten sorts of unions to be found in the World, of which we cannot stay here to speak. *Thomas* reduces all unto three. One union is of things that are absolute and perfect in themselves; as many stones make one heap. Another is, when things in nature perfect, are so united that they cease thereby to be perfect of themselves; as when the Elements concur to make one perfect mixt body. Thirdly, when diverse things being in nature imperfect not absolutely, but in that they are naturally capable of greater perfection, and tend thereunto; as the soul and body, and the several members of the body constitute one man. But after none of these, exactly, can Christ be said to consist of two natures united. Not the first way, because such things are rather relatively and denominatively one, than really. Not the second; because it were to suppose that the Divine Nature could be alterable and mutable: and because, if such a composition were

*Suidas in  
"Erys."  
3. Qu. 2. 1.*

were made, both the Divine and Humane nature must loose their natural being and kind, and so neither of both remain, but a third thing. Not the last, because both Divine and humane nature are perfect of themselves in their kind. So that in truth, speaking strictly, no precedent in Nature can be found answering this Union, called Hypostatical, or Personal: because it is the union of two intire Natures into one Person; and that, the Second person of the Trinity, God blessed for evermore. Out of the former, the last representeth this Mystery most clearly, and is often used by the ancient Fathers to express the same; and especially by *Athanasius* in his Creed, who thus declareth this mystery sufficiently to the sober and modest, and not curious mind. [*Christ is*] *God of the substance of the Father, begotten before the worlds, and man of the substance of his mother born in the world. Perfect God, and perfect man; of a reasonable soul, and humane flesh subsisting. Equal to God, as touching his God-head; and inferior to his Father as touching his Manhood: Who although he be God and man, yet he is not two, but one Christ. One, not by conversion of the Godhead into Flesh, but by taking of the manhood into God: One altogether, not by confusion of substance, but by unity of person. For as the reasonable soul and flesh is one man; so God and Man is one Christ.* Now the ground of this great mystery, is taken partly from the testimonies and descriptions of Christ the Mediator made in the Scripture: where, besides those already given, diverse proper to God are ascribed to him; and many which are proper to humane nature are attributed to him: and because there can be nothing more absurd in nature or Christian Religion, than to imagine that Christ is more than one Person, one Son, one Mediator; therefore it follows necessarily that this one Person must consist of more than one nature: and partly because the end of Christ being Incarnate, seemed to require this most necessarily. As First, there was all reason that the nature which sinned and offended should suffer, and satisfy; but none but humane nature had so sinned. Secondly, that he should be a Prophet to instruct and teach his Church. Thirdly, that he should be a King to rule and direct his Church, according to the Prophecies of old concerning him. For *Moses* truly said unto the Fathers, *a Prophet shall the Lord your God raise up unto you of your brethren, like unto me*; which must be of humane condition. Acts 3. 22.

Now according to this union of the Divine and Humane nature in one Person, may Christ in some sense be said to be a Mediator *Essential*, being a Mean Person, not simply God, nor simply Man: but this is not the proper Mediation of Christ between God and Man; but this rather consisteth in Acts performed, and Offices of Christ. And these acts of Christ may be distinguished into two sorts, Preparatory and Consummatory. The former I call preparatory, because they were ordained as useful expedencies, not as essential to Reconciliation between the parties at distance. And the first act of this nature was after the manner of Civil Arbitrements, to take the Case into serious consideration, and to deliberate with himself about the most proper means of attaining an amicable composure of differences on foot. And (as the Scripture Heb. 2. 14. saith) *forasmuch then as the children (of God to be redeemed) are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same, that through death he might destroy him who had the power of death, that is, the Devil.* It appearing unto him that there was no such proper or convenient means to Arbitrate between God and Man, as the taking upon him humane nature. For by this means, as *Moses* is said to be

Deut. 5.5.  
Gal. 3.  
Hebr. 9.15.  
12.24

Hebr. 5. 7.

1 John 2.1.

2 Cor. 5.18.

1 Tim. 2. 5,6.

Ephes. 5.2.

2 Cor. 5.21.

Rom. 3.25.

1 John 2.2.

Ephes. 2.16.

Rom. 5.ic.

the Intercessour (*medius et sequester*) between God and the People of *Israel* (and therefore the Law is said to have been given in the hand of a Mediatour, who was *Moses*) in like manner, Christ is called the Mediatour of a New Covenant, in the Epistle to the *Hebrews*: because the terms of that Covenant were obtained of God by Christ; and that Covenant was delivered unto him to manage and transact. Another Act of Christs mediation was by Prayers and Supplications, as it is in the Epistle to the *Hebrews*: *Who in the dayes of his Flesh, when he had offered up Prayers and Supplications, with strong crying and tears, unto him that was able to save him from death, was heard in that he feared.* And in this respect he is called our Advocate by St. *John*, saying, *If any man sin, we have an Advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the Righteous.* A third Act of Christ in his mediation related to Man, by offering to him the terms and means of Reconciliation in knowledge and sanctification, and moving him to accept of so favourable, free, and gracious terms of Reconciliation, as the doctrine of the Gospel presented to him; thus fully expressed by St. *Paul*. *All things are of God, who hath reconciled us unto himself in Jesus Christ, and hath given unto us the ministry of reconciliation: To wit, that God was in Christ reconciling the World unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them, and hath committed unto us the word of reconciliation. Now then we are Ambassadors for Christ, as though God did beseech you by us: we pray you in Christs stead, be ye reconciled unto God.*

But the second way of Mediation and Reconciliation is that which is most proper to Christ, the former being communicable to man in some sense; namely, as the received power and authority from Christ, as is even now shewed, to minister in Christs stead, as inferiour Instruments under him: And this is by making himself a Sacrifice and Satisfaction for sin: according to that of St. *Paul* to *Timothy*, *There is one God, and one Mediatour between God and Men, the Man Christ Jesus. Who gave himself a ransom for all, to be testified in due time.* And to the *Ephesians* he saith; *And walk in love as Christ also hath loved us, and given himself for us, an Offering and a Sacrifice to God, for a sweet smelling savour.* And when he saith, *For he hath made him to be sin for us who knew no sin*: it is manifest that sin, in the first place, is used according to the Hebrew word, for a Sacrifice for sin. Now nothing can be more frivolous in the ears of rational men, or more sacrilegious in Gods ears, than to draw this to such a kind of figurative speech as *Socinus* and his Fellows do, as should imply an occasionalness and exemplariness only in Christs death to take away sin, and not to satisfy Gods Justice for them: And so to satisfy, as a Doctor showing us the way, and as a President leading us the way towards peace with God. This, I say can, in no propriety of speech, be the meaning of holy Writ, assuring us first, That Christ was a Propitiation for us, as *Romans* 3. Whom God hath set forth as a Propitiation, through Faith in his blood. And St. *John*, *He is the Propitiation for our sins.* And St. *Paul* to the *Ephesians* tells us, how he became such a propitiation for us. *That he might reconcile both unto God, in one Body, by the Cross, having slain the enmity thereby*: Is Reconciliation of God and Man, and that by delivering up his body to death upon the Cross, no more than to give us good instructions how to serve God, so as to reconcile our selves to him? Is slaying the enmity, or extinguishing the enemy to us, the Devil; or the Enmity which was between God and us, no more than by good example to direct us how so to do? Saint *Paul* likewise to the *Romans* plainly affirmeth that he reconciled us to God by his death. Secondly, Who by purging us, or any man else, could understand,



derstand, before these dayes, no more than good words and counsels? But St. Paul sayes he *By himself purged our sins*. And that we may see that St. Paul was far from any such intention and forced sense as is modernly imposed on him, he writes thus also, *It was therefore necessary that the patens of things in the heavens should be purified with these, but the heavenly things themselves with better Sacrifices than these. For Christ, &c.* The meaning of which words must necessarily be this, that, whereas the errors and sins under the Law which were patens or types of the Gospel were expiated by blood and sacrifices: But the heavenly things were purged by better things, *i. e.* The Sacrifice of Christ. Therefore if it cannot be said that such things were purified only by good precepts and documents given, but real blood was shed for that purpose: Real, though much better and more precious blood was shed for the expiation and purification the sins of the Gospel: which blood was Christs. And thirdly, how most abusively must the tearms *Redeeming* and *Redemption* and *Redeemer* be used by the Scripture, beyond all other writings or speeches, if it signifies not a real recovery or purchase of somewhat lost, or necessary to one? Now such expressions applyed to Christs mediation, are so plain and frequent, that it may seem superfluous to recite them. St. Matthew saith, *The Son of Man came to give his life a ranfome for many*. St. Paul saith, *He gave himself for us, that he might redeem us from all iniquity*. St. Peter by his comparison used, sheweth what manner of purchase it was, saying; *Ye know that ye were not redeemed with corruptible things, as silver and gold, from your vain conversation received by tradition from your Fathers: but with the precious blood of Christ, as of a Lamb without blemish, without spot*. But redemption with silver and gold is proper, and expiation by the blood of Lambs was proper and real: therefore also must the redemption by the blood of Christ be so too. And in the Epistle to the *Hebrews* is the like comparison used most aptly, and at large. Fourthly, the tearms *Offering* and *Sacrifice* so often ascribe unto Christ, must needs import more then verbal, or exemplary mediation: divers of which places we have noted before: to which we may adde what in the *Hebrews* is directly spoken of Christ. *Who needed not daily, as their High Priests, to offer up Sacrifice, first for his own sins, and then for the peoples: for this he did once when he offered up himself*. And St. Paul to the *Corinthians*, *Christ our Passover is offered for us*. And St. John? *The Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the World*. And elsewhere to this effect.

Hebr. 13.

Heb. 9. 22, 23.

Matth. 20. 28.

Titus 2. 14.

1 Pet. 1. 18, 19.

Heb. 9. 12, 13, 14

Hebr. 7. 27.

1 Cor. 5. 7.

John 1. 29.

## CHAP. XVII.

*How Christ was Mediatour according to both Natures : Calvin's Opinion and others stated. Of the effect of Christs Mediation, and the extent thereof. Of the Designation and Application of Christs death. Of the Sufficiencie and Efficacie of Christs death. How Christs death becomes effectual to all : The Necessity of Gods Grace to incline the will of man to embrace Christ : Of the Efficacie as well as Sufficiencie of Gods Grace on the Will of Man. Several Gradations observed in the Grace of God.*

**B**UT from the Evidence of the evidence of the Fact, that so it was, that Christ suffered to satisfie for our sins, let us pass to the Manner, how it was ; and the Effects and Extent for whom he so suffered and satisfied ; because no small stir and contention hath been touching both ; but briefly. For there seems not to me to be such great cause, as is apprehended for such differences.

For first, surely Christs mediation was an Act of his Person, and not of his Natures, either of them separately considered : So that there seems the same reason for this, as for all other Acts and Attributes given to him : some whereof are naturally proper to the Divine Nature, and some to the Humane : and yet both these, predicable of Christ personally considered, by that received rule amongst Divines, which maintaineth a communication of Idioms ; or the ascribing the property of one nature to the entire Person, and so denominatively to the other. In which sense Christ is said to dye, to suffer, to hunger, to thirst, to be weary : and Christ is said to be Omniscient, Omnipotent, Omnipresent : yet not according to both Natures, but as they are united into one Person. So that all Acts and Offices of Christ as Mediatour, have a twofold consideration, Formal and Real, or *Virtual* and *Interpretative*, as they speak. Some Acts are so *formally Divine* in him, that they pertain to the Humane Nature only *Vertually* ; and some Acts are so *formally* and properly Humane that they pertain to the Divine Nature, only by way of *imputation* or *interpretation* ; and not immediately or properly. So that the Word Incarnate, Christ, is the immediate cause of his Mediation, and our Reconciliation, but all the Acts in particular tending tending to Christs mediation, as his preaching, and travelling, and Passion, did

did not proceed equally, or alike from both Natures. For two things are to be distinguished in the Actions or Passion of Christ mediating for mankind. The *Act* it self, and the *value* and *vertue* of that Action, in order to the reconciling of man to God. That the Acts conducing hereunto are only proper to the Humane Nature, is true according to *Stancarus* his opinion, though called Heretick, for the same; and opposed by *Calvine* and many of his Equals, who held that Christ was Mediatour according to his Divine and Humane Nature: And that *Calvine* and his Company must needs erre, is proved because they reject *Lombard* and those that follow him, who are the Romanists. *Lombards* Opinion was, That Christ was Mediatour as the Word Incarnate, but not according to both Natures. For they distinguish *Principium Quod*, and *Principium Quo*, That *Principle* or *Cause* of mediation from that *Whereby* he mediated. The first they confesse to be the Person of Christ, consisting of Divine and Humane Nature. The second they make the Humane Nature alone. And that *Calvine* and the rest meant any more, it is past the power of their Adversaries to make good; however, according to their wont, they strain all they can, and more than honestly they can, to make their Opinions foul and odious: For in substance, they speak the same thing with *Lombard*, though not altogether after the same manner: but the Deformer suspected him as justly for restraining Christs mediation and the value thereof to his Humanity, as the Romanists do them, for comprehending the Divinity in it. And rightly do they distinguish between the *Thing*, and the *Efficacie* of the thing: and that according to *Lombard* himself, whom they dislike, because he restrained (to their apprehension) the whole business of mediation to the Humane Nature: whereas though the Divine Nature did not formally act, or suffer to that end, yet it was by vertue of the Hypostatical Union with the Divine Nature, that the Humane Nature was in a capacity to mediate and merit for man: as *St. Austin* hath taught us in these words. *It was requisite that the Mediatour between God and Man should have somewhat like unto God, and somewhat like unto Men: lest being like God in all things, he should be too far from men; or being like unto Man in all things, he should be too far from God.* And yet indeed in another place he doth determine the mediation more properly to the Humanity of Christ, than to the Word, thus speaking: *Yet he is not for this a Mediatour, because he is the Word, and that especially, because he is immortal: and the most blessed Word is far from miserable Mortals: But he is Mediatour, in that he is Man; showing thereby, that we ought not to seek any other Mediatours to that, not only blessed, but beatifical Good, by whom we should have access, &c.* And to this agrees that of *St. Paul* to *Timothy*, *There is one God and one Mediatour between God and Man, the Man Christ Jesus.* And this is the chiefest place founding this Opinion, yet not simply, seeing it is an easie matter by a distinction to avoid the same, if one would be contentious: but if Charity, nay if Justice were done to each side, the ground of contention might fairly be removed, in this.

But with much more difficulty do we meet in the effect and extent of the mediation of Christ by his Death and Passion, *viz.* Whether it concerns all Mankind in general, or Whether all those who are called to the knowledge, faith, and profession of Christ and Christian Religion: or lastly, Whether it was properly and specially so designed and intended for such as were to be infallibly saved, that others were capable of no benefit of the same; but rather were determined to hardness and impenitencie, and persistence in unbelief.

See Melan-  
thon. Epist.  
ad Mathesium.

Mediator autem  
inter Deum &  
homines oportet  
ut haberet, & Aug.  
Confess. 10.  
c. 42.

Nec tamen ob  
hoc Mediator  
est, quia Verbum  
maxime  
quippe immortalitate. Id. Civit.  
Dei lib. 9.  
cap. 15.  
1 Tim 2.

Concern-



Exod. 4. 21.  
& 14. 17.  
Rom. 9. 18.  
Iſa. 6. 10.  
Deut. 2. 30.  
Iſa. 63. 17.

1 Sam. 26. 12.

Genes. 6. 2.

2 Cor. 5. 19.

Joh. 3. 16.

Concerning the laſt and harſheſt part of this doubt, we have heretofore answered, that though the Holy Scriptures (which cannot be denyed) do aſcribe unto God in poſitive tearms, hardening of ſome, yet the meaning can be no more than that from certain perſons, he ſo withdraws his mollifying and maturing Grace to Repentance and Faith, that an effect of Obduration doth thereupon, in ſuch manner follow, as if God himſelf were the proper and direct Author of it. For all egregious things are, according to the phraſe of Scripture, often aſcribed unto God. As where we read a *Sleep from the Lord was fallen upon the ſervants of Saul*: that is, a profound, or as it is there ſaid, a *deep ſleep*: though I deny not, but this might be literally verified. And we read according to the original, of Oaks of God, and Hills of God, which import no more than exceeding high and ſtately ones. And I make no doubt but when it is ſaid, *The ſons of God ſaw the daughters of men, that they were fair, &c.* Angels are not thereby intended; and doubt, whether, as is commonly conjectur'd, The children of God, or holy Seed, be there aimed at. For no reaſon can be given why Gyants ſhould be rather born of them than wicked men; but rather that they were a race of Men of extraordinary ſtature, called therefore the *Sons of God*, becauſe of their exceſſive greatneſs, as all other mighty things are ſaid to be of God: in which ſenſe egregious hardneſs is imputed unto God.

But to the main difficulty we muſt answer from the various manifeſtations of Gods love to Mankind. And where can we better begin to judge hereof, than from the firſt and ſecond ſtate of Man, his Inſtitution and Reſtauration? It is here taken for granted, That whole Mankind fell at once in *Adam*, from its priſtine perfection. And it is no leſs apparent, that God purpoſing to reſtore Man again, and recover him, treated as it were, and concluded with the ſame perſon *Adam*, and in the ſame capacity that he fell in. He fell, as is ſaid, equally to all men future, without any diſcrimination of worſe, or better: higher or lower: and God treated and covenanted with him, without any claue of diſtinction, or exception of any one ſingle perſon: For in truth, though all actions relate immediately to perſons, yet the ſubſtance of the Treaty concerned principally the nature in general of Man; the promiſes of God being made with the Seed of the Woman, and Man, without any reſtriction or limitation: as St. *Paul* teaches, thus ſaying; *God was in Chriſt reconciling the world unto himſelf*: by which is ſignified a general and indiſtinct gift of God towards the laſed maſs of Mankind: which gift likewise is expreſſed in the ſame latitude by St. *John*. *For God ſo loved the World, that he gave his only begotten Son: that whoſoever believes in him ſhould not periſh, but have everlaſting life.* But if there were in the firſt intention of God, any diſparity in exhibiting his ſon to the world, of that nature, that thereby certain perſons ſhould be excluded remedileſly from the number; for whom Chriſt dyed, then could it no more be ſaid that Chriſt became incarnate for them; then for the Devils, whoſe nature Chriſt took not. But ſurely there was a diſtinction made between reprobate Men, and reprobate Spirits. But this is not answered by the diſtinction in general, of *Sufficiencie* and *Efficiencie*, or efficacie of Chriſts death, uſed by *Perkins*, ſaying; *That Chriſts death was ſufficient for all, but became not effectual to all.* This is notoriously true, and undenyable; and that, as he ſayes, it was ſufficient for the redemption of many worlds if caſe required. For ſo it might be ſaid, It was ſufficient for the redemption of Devils too, for ought we know. And what of this? But *Perkins* ſeems to make a little bolder and farther ſtep, where he grants a kind of efficacie too:

too: but somewhat of the harſheſt ſenſe: For diſtinguiſhing between *Potential* and *Actual* Efficacie, he addeth; *Chriſt dyed potentially effectually for all men, but not actually effectually.* But this potential efficacy rightly underſtood, amounts to no more than a ſimple Sufficiencie; in regard that this Vertue, according to him, was never intended by God to be actuated in the behalf of the unpredeſtinated to life and glory.

A ſecond prejudice againſt that interpretation is, That the Scripture ſpeaking of the death of Chriſt and his Paſſion, doth not ſpeak of it as of a ſufficient rate and price in general, but a payment alſo actually made for all: for ſuch is the importance of the words *ἄντες*, *Ἀντὶ πάντων*, *Ἀπολύτρωσις*: Which ſignifie an actual payment, in relation to an obligation of Debt or Bondage; which places of Scripture we have before given. Thirdly, the Decree of exhibiting Chriſt actually and effectually in ſpecial manner to ſome elect perſons, who receive him by Faith, being thereunto moved and enabled by Gods inſpirations, is altogether poſterior to the exhibition of Chriſt to Mankind in general; and therefore can be no real cauſe of Gods diſtinct intention then: or that God ſhould at his firſt propounding, put a difference in the manner of exhibiting Chriſts Perſons. For all this while we muſt allow two diſtinct Periods of Gods favourable Providence toward Man, in reſtoring him: the one, in his general Ordination of his Son to redeem him: the other, in the ſpecial collation and application of that benefit to man. God gave his Son; and in him, his Obedience both in life and death to All men: But the effect and benefit of theſe redounded actually only to ſome ſelect perſons: This latter is undeniable by all ſides. For who did ever ſay that all men were actually ſaved by Chriſt? I know the former, *i. e.* That Chriſt was *ἄντες*, a Payment made for all, is rejected by *Perkins* and his Affertour and Apologiſt *Twiffe*. And true it is, that in very tearms above-mentioned, it is ſcarce to be found that Chriſt gave himſelf without a note of Reſtitution and Limitation, ſuch as *Many*, or *To them that receive him, and believe in him*. But then as the Scripture ſaith not in expreſs tearms, that Chriſt was a Ransom or Payment made for all; ſo neither doth it ſay, *Only* for the Elect, excluſively. And when it ſaith, *Chriſt was the Lamb of God that taketh away the ſins of the World*. And that *God ſo loved the World that he gave his only begotten Son*. And elſewhere, *That the Father ſent the Son to be the Saviour of the World*. We ſhall not need to ſhew how the Scripture doth frequently uſe the word *World* in oppoſition to *true Believers*: as where *St. John* hath theſe words, *The World knew him not*. And again, *I pray for them, I pray not for the World, &c.* and ſo in other places; which do imply a Right the very Wicked and Reprobates have in Chriſt.

John 1. 29.  
John 3. 16.  
1 John 4. 14.

John 1.  
John 17. 9.

And whereas a principal argument is drawn from the words in *St. John*, laſt cited, to prove an inequality of intereſt in Chriſts death and mediation, thus: *Chriſt only dyed for them he prayed for, but Chriſt prayed not for the World, i. e.* the Wicked; *Therefore he dyed not for them*. If this were true, that Chriſt never prayed for the wicked; or for thoſe that were not then given actually to him, as were his Diſciples, for whom he there particularly prays, the argument would be of the greater force; but it is not ſo, any more then it is true in all reſpects, what Chriſt ſaith of himſelf in *St. Matthew*, *I am not ſent but unto the loſt ſheep of the houſe of Iſrael*. So that as Chriſt before his reſurrection ſhewed himſelf very nice, how he dealt the Word of Life to the Gentiles, ſo might he, at the ſame time, declare a more ſpecial deſire of the ſalvation of his elected Servants, than of others.

Matth. 15. 24.

others. For we know (which is another answer) how the Scripture frequently, by a note of Denial, doth not intend an *absolute* exclusion of a thing, but *comparative* only: as where God says, *I will have mercy and not sacrifice*. Christ prayed not for the world; so intently and particularly; or at that time: Therefore he prayed not at all, is no good consequence. And no more is that which is made from an adequateness of the Death of Christ to the actual application of the merits of the same death, by such intercession as Prayer. So that though Christ did not actually pray for all, yet he might dye for all: according to the distinction of a twofo'd Exhibition of Christ abovesaid. For Christ was exhibited as an efficacious *Means* of Salvation: and as an efficacious *Cure*. A precious Antidote or Salve is, in its own nature, and the intention of the Compounder, equally operative and effectual to all Persons in like manner affected. All men naturally were involved in the same evil, alike affected and infected: And Christs Death and Passion alike sovereign to all persons, and ordained for all: And the difference in the first Case and the second, is only in the actual Application thereof: For as many as receive that, are certainly cured. And the Scripture tells us, *As many as receive him* (Christ) *to them gave he power to become the Sons of God: to them that believe in his name*. Therefore the main enquiry is much more about the difference and variety outward, then in the means it self: And how, and whence it comes to pass, that the Death and Passion of Christ are so applyed to one above another, that to one they become actually efficacious, and to another in aptitude and general institution only.

If in answer to this doubt we shall say, That by Faith and Repentance we are made partakers of Christ, we shall answer most truly, but not sufficiently; because the same difficulty returns upon us, How some believe, and embrace Christ, and are made partakers of his benefits, and not others; seeing so great salvation is tendered to all?

Here it is absolutely necessary to take in the Grace of God, and his free love towards Mankind, in some sense at least, by all that will be accounted Christians; and not by wisdom make void the Cross of Christ. For supposing that God hath made a free and general Covenant with Mankind, which Covenant neither is, nor can (as it is a Covenant) be simple and unconditionate, so far, as nothing should be required thereby of Man, to the being capable of the benefit of it; it will of necessity follow, that the knowledge of this Covenant of Grace, must be had by such as receive any benefit thereby: For else, how is it possible that they should fulfill, in any manner, the Condition required; were it no more than some will make it, to receive it by Faith, without any more ado, then to believe themselves into Gods Grace and Favour by a tacite internal act.

And this, and no more being supposed, that such love and gracious purpose (for which no natural Cause can be found out to certify or satisfy any man in the truth thereof) were ordained for any specially, it must be known by Revelation and not Ratiocination: And all extraordinary Revelations, besides and above what Nature can discover, are purely Acts of Grace, and not of Work. And therefore, why God doth reveal his Gospel to one people or person, and not to another, can have no other original Cause then the *[Beneplacitum]* Good pleasure of God; as is plainly affirmed by Christ himself. *Neither knoweth any man the Father but the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal him*: And before; *I thank thee, O Father, Lord of Heaven and Earth, because thou hast hid those things from*

*Quantum in Medico est, sanare venit aegrotum. Ipse se interimit qui praecepta Medici observare non vult. Aug. in Joan. cap. 3. 17.*

John 1. 12.

Matth. 11. 27.

v. 25.



*from the wise and prudent, and revealed them unto babes.* And in St. Peters case; *Flesh and blood hath not revealed this unto thee.* And St. Paul saith, *The Natural man cannot know the things of God, because they are spiritually discerned.* From whence it is manifest that though God hath decreed the Salvation of a man by Christ, yet this general intention cannot possibly take effect without a super-added Act of Free Grace, whereby this Reparation is made known. Again, it follows, That there is no obligation upon God antecedent to his own will and inclination, moving him to reveal the same; and that only, out of Congruity, not of Justice or Necessity; as supposing a decree given to Man, which would be wholly unprofitable and vain, without such revelation. But why one Man or Nation should be blessed with this gift rather than another, there is not so much as congruity to be fairly alledged, or reasonably offered.

And as this is the first act of God on the understanding of Man, towards his restitution; so is the second act of Man flowing mixtly from his Will and Understanding both, altogether owing to Gods Grace; and that is believing what before he knew. For that this is necessary, no doubt can be made, or that this is the true cause of being profited, or not, by Christ; St. Paul thus writing: *For unto us was the Gospel preached as well as unto them: but the word preached did not profit them, not being mixed with Faith in them that heard it.* This diversity is very great, but what is the cause of it, is not agreed upon. For if any shall say, It comes from the difference found in Christ as Mediatour, he is known to be mistaken by what is said. If any one shall say, It proceeds from the will and free Election of Man, he falls into a worse absurdity, for the will of man, as free, acts or works nothing at all, but as determined either by its self, or by some other: And if by it self, either simply and absolutely, or joyntly with another cause. And this cause must be either taken from somewhat outward, as the object duly propounded, or inward, by way of efficiencie. But it cannot be any outward object presenting it self, only as a final cause, which hath only a moral and not natural influence: For if it be demanded to what end such an inward act of the will is exercised, it may very properly and truly be said, because of the good discerned, and affected in the object: But if it should be asked, How the Will is moved, and by vertue of what ability it so moves to that object? there could be no greater incongruity than to affirm, That the object was the cause of it: For here the efficient cause is sought after. As when a man goes to Church, if doubt should be made why he goes to Church, it were easily answered, because he apprehends a spiritual good in that act; this is the final cause: but doth this give his leggs strength, and his nerves and sinews power to walk? Sure no man will say so. This then is that we enquire concerning the wills inclination to and election of spiritual things, not why? or to what end (for the end is the same to all mens wills) but, by what means it is fitted and enabled to move thitherward, rather than the contrary ways. The answer to this must (if a man will speak appositely) be taken from the efficient cause.

Now this sufficiencie or efficacie in the will, is either natural and common to all, which all modest Divines explode, or adventitious, and of free, undeserved, and undesired Grace and Gift of God. Hence another ascent is made towards the Question, of the manner of acceptation of grace and mercy, *objectively* taken. For as it is plain, that God putteth a difference, and not Man, between the understanding of one man and another, revealing that to one, which he doth not to another: And of those that know the truth, putting a difference between the wills of men, in that

Rom. 11. 7.

some, that have known the saving truth, have rejected it; and others embraced it: as is yet farther manifest from St. Paul to the *Romans*. *What then? Israel hath not obtained that which he seeketh for: but the Election hath obtained.* To some then, who know the truth, God gives Grace, to some he doth not, or scarce discernable.

A third step to this then, must be about the degree and efficacie of this first Grace of God preventing and preparing the will to such noble ends; which it could never of it self affect or desire: And whether God doth give the like Grace, at least in proportion, to all he hath so far called, illuminated and affected as to have spiritual principles of Life and Motion, or not? It were too curious to enquire here about the Arithmetical proportion or quantity; because that all mens constitutions and dispositions are not alike: and therefore, like more even timber or plyant clay, may be wrought into due form by less forcible means: but Whether, considering all disparities and disproportion in the matter, the influence fashioning the same, be of it self sufficient to any one called and outwardly elected to the truth: Or whether there be any sufficient Grace which is not efficacious and consummative of the end? which is the thing denyed by *Janse- nius* against a stream of Adversaries. But *Thomas*, who next to *Augustine* ruled these Disputes most of all, and that upon *Austin's* doctrine and grounds, sayes no less; and so do such as stick close to him; notwithstanding the strong opposition made by a Modern Order, who think to change the world, and make it take all doctrines from them to the contempt of their Predecessors, and the recalling the exil'd Tenets of Pelagians, and such as serve, though at a distance, under him. They profess against him, and hold for him: They deny his Conclusions, but approve and justifie his Principles and Premisses, from which they certainly follow. Neither can they give St. *Augustine* a good word, whom none openly, before them, ever presumed to confront in that manner. Or, if they do speak kindly of him, yet they take their own course, and speak their own upstart sense. For do they not place God as an idle Spectatour, yea a servile Attender of the wills self-determination first, and then bring him in as Auxiliarie to its Actions? This is rancide Divinity, yea and Philosophy too. Do they not fall directly into that Opinion of *Origen* confuted by *Thomas*, against the Gentiles, thus. *Certain men not understanding how God causeth the motion of the will in us, without prejudice to the liberty of the will in us; have endeavoured to expound these Authorities* [above-mentioned in his former Chapters] *amiss; as to say God causeth in us To will and to do, in that he giveth us power to will, but not so, as to cause us to do this, or that, as Origen expounds it in his Third Periar- chon, defending Free will against the foresaid Authorities. And from hence the Opinion of some seemeth to have proceeded, who said, Providence was not concerned in those things which related to Free will, that is, Elections; but external matters only—— who are confuted by that one place of Esay, Thou also hath wrought all our works in us.* Whether these words of the Prophet may not be eluded, I will not dispute, but they plainly declare that, according to *Thomas* his mind, All our inward motions as well as outward acts and effects, are governed by God. For the immediate concurrence of God being generally granted by Philosophical Divines, necessary to the Act of limited and necessary causes, whose principle is more certain and operative than Free Agents are; What honest or sober doubt can be made of the immediate hand of God in moving the will free, and void of

*Thomas cont.*  
*Gent. l. 3. c. 89.*

*Isaiah 26. 12.*

of such natural Laws and Propensions, as irrational Agents are compelled by? There seems much less use of it here, than there. It may be, they fear Gods hand should light so heavy upon the will of Man, as to hurt the Freedom of it. Which were to be feared indeed, if God so concurred with Free Agents, as with Natural; and proportioned not his Influences agreeable to the subject; but surely God worketh not so rudely: Or if the Act of God, being as natural to the Creature, as its own, yea unseparable from that of the Creature, were not a *Total* cause together with the Creatures, of such Elections. But, as *Thomas* saith, *It is apparent that not in the like manner an effect is ascribed to the Natural Cause, and to the Divine Power, as if it proceeded partly from God, and partly from the Natural Agent: but it is wholly from both, in a diverse respect: as the whole effect is attributed as well to the Principal Agent, as the Instrument.* Thus he. From whence we conclude, the Grace of God is not given in a common manner, or competently, to leave the will still separately, without particular excitations and præ-motions, effectually and immutably (as *Thomas* speaks) inclining it to embrace Christ exhibited in the Means of Grace: And that no man originally causes himself to differ from another in electing good: But supposing the like proportion of Grace given to two persons equally, otherwise qualified, the reason why one refuses the Good and chooses the Evil, is not to be taken from the meer use of the Freedom of Will, by one better than another, of himself; and improving that stock of Grace given of God, by his own strength better than his Fellow, but because the Grace of God, besides the common stock, moves one more particularly than it doth the other.

How the will of Man is salved, we have before shown in part; in that we put an immense difference of influences between outward and intrinsick motions; and between the impressions made upon it by a created and increased Agent: Neither have we passed over that other common and obvious objection against such absolute necessity of Gods concurrence, taken from the Commands, Exhortations, and Communications which should (they say) be all to no purpose and illusorie, if there remained no power in man to do as he is commanded; or not to do what he is forbidden: For surely, Gods commands and dehortations are binding most of them, where he gives no such general aids of Grace, as he doth to many persons who are unfruitful under it. Therefore it becomes them who object this no less than us, to answer the difficulty. Again, there is nothing more plain in Scripture than that God requires that of the Creature which it is impossible for it to do without his immediate power. When God said at the beginning, *Let there be Light*; when it wholly lay upon him to produce Light: When Christ said to the Creeple in the Gospel, *Take up thy bed and walk*. When he said to the man with the withered hand, *Stretch out thy hand*: Yea when he said unto *Lazarus* dead and buried, *Lazarus arise*, did he suppose an ability antecedent and præ-existing to his Commands or Exhortations? No man surely ever phansied so much. How then comes it to pass, that those were not absurd and irrational, but these, whereby man is brought to spiritual life, must be condemned for such? But to this purpose we have spoken before.

But to excuse God from double dealing with Man, in that he exacts that of reprobated persons who cannot act obediently to it as they are required, for want of his necessary assistance, there is brought into great use, and not lately neither, the distinction of [ *Voluntas Beneplaciti* and *Signi* ] a will of *Good-pleasure*, and a will of *Sign*; or a will Signified, and a will Concealed:

*Contr. Gentil. 3.  
c. 70.*

*Exigit & postulatur à nobis  
Vocamus, ut  
habeat occasionem  
donandi,  
ut ipsi tribuat  
quod erogavit.  
Origen. Hom.  
35. in Lucam.*

Gen. 1.

Mark 2. 9.

Matth. 12. 13.

John 11.



a secret will, and revealed : which indeed are very untowardly and improperly devised. For if they would speak intelligibly, they should rather have called that revealed Will *Signum Voluntatis*, than *Voluntas Signi* : because it can be no other then an intimation of Gods Will. And if sincerely they would speak, they should not have made the manifestation of Gods Will by signs or otherwise, a distinct will from his secret Will, of which it is an Indication. Dr. Twisse therefore perhaps suspecting this inconveniencie distinguishes to the same effect, but more artificially, between *Voluntas Præcepti*, and *Voluntas Propositi*, a Will of Precept, and a Will of Purpose in God answering the contradictions contained in the Objection above made by the help of it : For, sayes he to *Arminius* against *Perkins*, the opposition were plain and real if God had decreed and purposed with himself one thing, and decreed another thing to Man ; but this we find not. But it is no contradiction for God to decree one thing, as that *Peter* should deny his Master, and to give out a command to the contrary, that he should not deny him. By this means indeed he answers the Logical contradiction of terms and proposition, very sufficiently, and no more : but he does not take off the moral opposition and inconsistency of the things themselves. For may not a man be said to cross and contrary himself, who shall resolve to revenge himself on his Adversary, and in the mean time gives him good words, and perhaps advise to beware of him ? As when a man sayes to him he owes and intends a mischief, *Take heed, look to your self, I shall meet with you, I will be even with you.* These words spoken seriously would be very ridiculous, viz. That a man at the same time, should kindly admonish contrary to his resolution and purpose : and taken otherwise, agreeable to the false nature of Man who may dissemble, but not to the Majesty and Simplicity of God : who needs no such arts to fetch in his enemies. Certainly therefore God doth seriously intend not to punish when he threatens, as *Chrysostome* hath observed, and intend seriously to save when he warns. But whom ? All those that are in the noise of such Precepts or Communications ? If indeed Gods Word were preached, and his Will revealed as directly to impenitent and incorrigible men to whom he hath no such real purpose as to save them, then might he be subject to like accusations, as men are, who particularly apply themselves to their enemies : but so God dealeth not with the wicked, whom he rejecteth, or denyeth efficacious Grace to. For (as hath been said) the Promises of God, and Precepts, and Exhortations were not in the secret or express Will of God ordained for the reprobate primarily, but indirectly only, and as mixed and indiscernible to the Messengers of God, from the Righteous. And however the success in ministering to the wicked answers not the intention of the Instrument, Man ; yet such zealous endeavours by Man, never go unrewarded by God : and so it is not in vain in the Lord. For as *St. Paul* speaks appositely, *What if some did not believe, shall their unbelief make the Faith of God of none effect ?* The means of Faith are not in vain, though the Non-elect profit not : Seeing as *St. Paul* saith again, *The Election hath obtained, and the rest were blinded.*

Rom. 3. 3.

Rom. 11. 7.

To recollect therefore what hath passed on this subject : the several Gradations of Gods favour to lost Man may be said to be these. First, by an absolute irrespective Act of Grace, he determined to re-enter into Covenant with Man for his Restauration. Secondly, he ordained this Covenant to be in the hands of his Son, as Mediatour. Thirdly, that his Son by taking humane Nature, should accomplish in Mans behalf, whatever was required by Gods Justice of him. Fourthly, that the effect and benefits of Christs Death

Death and Passion should not inconditionately and immediately be made over unto all, but by the means and conveyance of Faith working by Love and Obedience. Fifthly, that this Obedience of Faith should not necessarily follow upon the propounding of Christ crucified to the Ear, but by the inspiration of Grace into the soul, opening the door of the heart as it did *Lyddia's*, to let in Christ as well with his sanctifying as satisfying Graces. For as *Jansenius* hath well observed out of *Austin*, there is a twofold Grace of God in Christ Jesus, necessary to a Christian, *Sanative Grace*, and *Operative*; or *Healing* and *Helping* Grace. The soul of Man being maimed and disabled by his Fall, must have a Grace to cure and restore the broken state thereof, before outward means can avail to the enabling it to be obedient, and to perform acts of a new and spiritual Life: adding, That it would be all one for to offer Grace to the soul of man, so diseased, as it would be to offer a pair of Spectacles to a blind man, or a staff to him whose legs be broken. And I wonder much to find him charged by a very learned Authour of late, that he hath not given us the true efficient cause of the wills of obedience, wherein (as he well observes) consisteth the principal difficulty of all, but only the Formal, and wherein the efficacie of Grace consisteth. For he that shall consult his Fourth Book! *De Gratia Christi*, cap. 1. and so on, will easily perceive, he makes it to be, *The Grace of God sweetly and unutterably delighting, by which the Will is prevented, and bowed to will and do whatever God hath ordained it should do and will.* Surely this is much more than a formal Cause, whereby a thing actually is whatever it is. And in this manner is the true Believer made partaker of the benefits of Christs Death and Passion, to his Sanctification and Justification!

*Jansen. Aug.  
To. 3. lib. 2. c. 1.*

*Id. Tom. 3. lib.  
3. c. 1.*

## CHAP. XVIII.

*Of the effect and benefit of Christs Mediation in suffering and rising again, seen in the Resurrection of Man. The necessity of believing a Resurrection. The Reasons and Scriptural Testimonies proving a Resurrection. Objections against the same answered.*

**O**F the Justification and Sanctification of a man by Christ; we have heretofore spoken: it remains now, for the Conclusion of this First Part, that we here speak of the most perfect, and noble effect of Christs mediation seen in the salvation of Man, or his state of perfect Restitution in bliss; to which, Grace here in this life is but a Prelude and an Introduction. And to this end, the immediate way hereunto, the Resurrection, is to be explained, as a principle Article of Christian Faith. For this also is an effect of Christ our Mediatour, as St. *Austin* witnesseth in these words; *The Resurrection of souls is effected by the eternal and immutable substance of Father and Son, but the Resurrection of the Body is by the temporal, and not co-eternal Dispensation of the humanity of the Son.* And St. *Ambrose* speaks well to this purpose: *They who think that souls are immortal, do not sufficiently pacifie me; while they redeem me but in part: For what great favour can it be to me, when I am not wholly delivered? What life can that be, if the work of God in me must perish? Where is Gods justice, if the same natural end be to the just and wicked in common?*

*Aug. Tract. 23.  
in Joann.  
John 6 54.*

*Ambros de Fi-  
de Resurrect.  
Illi quidam qui  
dicunt animas,  
&c.*

They that would therefore make sure work against infidelity, bring their grounds for this point, from the Gentiles themselves; whom they would convert to this opinion. But both the artificial and inartificial arguments, reason and testimony of the most famous Philosophers, not taken from, and grounded upon Divine Revelations, will certainly be found insufficient. For surely it may be said of the profession of this Article of Faith, what Christ saith of *Peters* confession of him, *Flesh and Blood hath not revealed it unto thee.* For what the Heathen invented of their own heads, concerning the Immortality of the Soul (if that they invented, and not rather received from others, better informed) they soon corrupted into an opinion of Transmigration, and shifting of Possessions, as men do Farms, when their Lease is expired; or as Liquor is transfused from vessel to vessel: For so much one of their principal words imports, used to signify their meaning. And of the Bodies Resurrection, little or nothing do we read amongst them. But this is the chief point in our Christian Faith: and this is that which the ancient Fathers contend for; proving there is no proper

*Metempsychosis.*



proper resurrection but this; as particularly the Constitutions of the Apostles. Resurrection say they is of things that were fallen. Which solid argument is also used by *Epiphanius*; shewing that because the Body only properly falls to earth, therefore it is the body chiefly we are to believe shall be raised again: And therefore the Athanasian and Nicene Creeds as supplements to the Apostolical, express the body in particular, and the flesh to be restored.

And however fair and laudable attempts are made by the Ancients to persuade rather than prove a Resurrection, from the several prettie Analogies found in nature of things perishing, and after a while returning again to their pristine beauty and perfection; yet not to except against them particularly, How can we suppose they, who knew little of the true God, should understand so much as Gods people, who had not this revealed in direct terms, but in types and shadows, and resemblances; which have a more literal and historical sense than this would be? And it hath exercised the Pens of learned men both ways, to enquire, Whether the Jews generally believe any more than *Pythagoras*, or *Plato* might have learnt of them, a life after the dissolution of the body, and a state of blifs, after a just and miserable life and death in this world: all which, as they prove not the Resurrection of the body, which is the chief point of Christian Faith. The expressions in the Book of *Maccabees*, of the Mother expecting to have her children raised again; especially taking the Comment of St. *Paul* upon that Text (as is generally believed) along with it (though it may well be understood of those more Canonical Histories relating how the Shunamites son was restored to Life again by *Elisba*). And the many divine sayings in the Book of *Wisdom* do declare a great and glorious prerogative belonging to the Just and Righteous above the wicked in the world to come; but what is said may be restrained to the Immortality of the Spirit of men; little or no mention being made of the Resurrection of the Body. Yet in *Esdra*s we have these words expressly; *Wheresoever thou findest the dead, take them and bury them, and I will give thee the first place in my Resurrection.* But this Book is not received by the Romanists themselves, and in all probabity was much later then the rest: however it may be said to deliver the current opinion of that Church then. And in *Maccabees* there is mention made of being raised again, and of a Resurrection, which (as is said) must relate to the Body fallen. And in the same Book, He that offered for the dead is commended, *in that he was mindful of the Resurrection.* But none convince us more of a Catholick opinion amongst the Jews, received doubtless as a Tradition from their Fathers, and supposed to their more express prescriptions in Gods worship, then that of *Martha* to Christ, *I know that he shall rise again in the Resurrection at the last day.* And now-a-days the Jews are so well settled in the Doctrine of the Resurrection, that they envie the faith of it to any but themselves, saying, as *Buxtorf* hath it; *There are four things which the Israelites have from God in especial manner, above other Nations: The Land of Canaan; The Law; Prophecie, and The Resurrection of the Dead.* But in my judgment, St. *Paul* puts it out of all question that the Jews believed of old a Resurrection, and that of the Body; of which we now speak. For thus in the *Acts* of the Apostles he speaks; *And have hope towards God, which they themselves also allow that there shall be a Resurrection of the dead, both of the just and unjust.*

And this Doctrine seemed so essential to St. *Paul*, that without it all Christian Faith were lost: as appears out of that most sublime and eloquent Chapter

Καὶ οὕτως ὁ  
ἐστὶν ἀνάστα-  
σις, &c.  
Conf. Apost.  
Lib. 5. c. 6.  
Epiphani. Lib.  
2. Hæres. 64.  
Ἀνάστασις

ἡ ἀνάστασις  
τοῦ σώματος

τῶν ὁσίων  
καὶ τῶν φθαρ-  
τῶν, &c.

Θεοδωρ. Ἁ-  
ρετικ. Fabu-  
lar. lib. 5.  
cap. 19.

Τὸν δὲ ἀνα-  
στάσις περὶ  
τῶν ὁσίων

ἀθανάσιον.  
Athanas. de  
Incarnatione.

2 Macch. 7. 9.  
Heb. 11. 35.

2 Kings 4.  
Wild. 3.

2 Esdr. 2. 23.

2 Macc. 7. 14.

Chap. 12. 43.

John 11. 24.

Buxt. Synag.  
cap. 3.

Acts 24. 15.

1 Cor. 15. Chapter concerning it to the *Corinthians*: where, first he layes down his ground of Christian Faith, Christs Death and Resurrection, as that, upon  
 v. 2. which all other Articles are founded, and without which all preaching and  
 v. 12. all Faith would be in vain. And from hence he infers at least a possibility that our bodies being of flesh and blood, of the same nature, shall also rise  
 20. again: And that Christs Resurrection was but as the first fruits to the harvest or vintage; which in order must necessarily follow. And having asserted and confirmed the truth, he answers the objections which may seem to disprove it; which method we here choose briefly to imitate and follow.  
 35, &c. And first, we argue from the term Resurrection which must needs imply somewhat fallen or dissolved, as is said: as *Tertullian* against *Marcion* doth affirm.

Secondly, From the Example of Christ, the exemplary cause of our Resurrection. For according to St. *Pauls* disputation at large, there is the same reason for the Resurrection of us, as of Christ. But Christs body was raised up in that individual substance that was laid in the Grave, and therefore must ours likewise: And this is it which is affirmed and promised by the Apostle to the *Thessalonians*. For if we believe that Jesus dyed and rose again, even us also, which sleep in Jesus, will God bring with him. And no doubt can be made but Christ had flesh and blood, after his Resurrection, the signs and marks show'd to that purpose, convincing not only incredulous *Thomas*, but all of like difficulty of Faith.

Thirdly, It appeareth from the comparison made by St. *Paul* to the *Corinthians*, As in Adam all dye, even so in Christ shall all be made alive. But every one in his own order, &c. But in Adam all men died corporally, therefore in Christ shall all be raised corporally, or in their own bodies: as *Tertullian*.

Fourthly, If immortality be promised to this body, then must this body arise, and not another: But to this mortal body is promised immortality; therefore, it must rise, because there is no imaginable way to have that verified, but by a Resurrection. And St. *Paul* saith, This corruptible must put on incorruption; and this mortal must put on immortality. And what can we suppose the Apostle aimed at in those words, but his own flesh and others? And how shall they that are in the Graves hear Christs voice, as he saith in St. *John*, unless they be raised by him?

Sixthly, An argument may be drawn from the truth and justice of God, copiously prosecuted by the ancient Fathers and their Followers, grounding themselves upon the word of God, which saith, We must all appear before the Judgment Seat of Christ, that every man may receive the things done in his body, according to that he hath done, whether it be good or evil. But without the Resurrection of the body, this distribution of Justice cannot be made. And so, what will become of those new and bold Philosophers, and their Dogmes unchristian, who liberally grant (and this is more than we have reason to expect from them) that there shall be a special time of Restitution of all things (and so the soul shall enter again into a body) but not that individual substance, which before was united to it; but yet one, making the same individual Person which was before: And how so? Why, the Form, according to *Aristotle* is, all and all, as to the constituting the same thing: and therefore, it alone can denominate a man the same, though the matter be various. But how then can it be said with any truth, that every man shall give an account for what he hath done in such a body, when, according to this sacrilegious phansie, it is not the same, but another body?

Lastly,

*Iniquus enim Deus si non per id puniatur qui, aut iuvatur, per quod operatus est. Id. Tert. cap. 12.*

*ib. v. 53.*

*John 5. 28.*

*2 Cor. 5. 10.*

*Luke 24. 19. John 20. 27.*

*1 Cor. 15. 22. 23.*

*Tertull. ubi supra.*

*1 Thess. 4. 14.*

*v. 12, 13.*

*Tertull. Adver. Marc. l. 5. c. 9.*

*35, &c.*

*20.*

*v. 12.*

*v. 2.*

*1 Cor. 15.*

Lastly, Such as was the Resurrection of men miracu'ously wrought in the Old and New Testament, is to be the Resurrection, in substance, the last day. But the child raised by *Elijah*; and that other by *Elisba*: And the man rising to life, who was cast upon the bones of *Elisba*; and all those raised by Christ, in his life time, and at his death: When the dead bodies of the Saints arose out of their graves, arose all in their bodies in which they dyed. Therefore surely such is our Resurrection to be.

1 Kings 17. 23  
2 Kings 4. 34.  
cap. 13. 21.  
Matth. 27. 52.

Now because there remain some sore objections to be cleared before Faith can have its perfect work on Christian minds, I shall not expatiate, contrary to my general purpose to answer all; but only that which is all; and that out of *Sr. Chrysostomes* words thus rendered: *But there are some* (saith he) *that disbelieve this thing, because they are ignorant of God. For pray tell me, which is the easier of the two, to bring a thing out of nothing, or to restore again things that have been dissolved? But what say they? They say, such a man hath suffered shipwrack and is drown'd, and so fallen, many fishes have devour'd him, and every one hath eat some part of those fishes. Afterward, of those very fishes some were taken in one haven, and some in another, and eaten of others. And again, these men that have eaten these fishes which devour'd the man happen to dye in other Countries, and that perhaps devoured by wild beasts. Such a confusion and dissipation being made, how shall that man rise again? Who is he that reduces the dust again? But why, O man, dost thou thus speak? and patches a long train of tales together, and offereest it as insoluble? For answer me: What if that man doth not go to Sea, and be not drown'd? If no fish eat him? nor the fish be afterward eaten of infinite men, but that he be laid decently in his Coffin, and neither worms nor any thing else molest him: How shall that dust and ashes be compacted together again? Whence shall that body flourish again? Is not this unanswerable? If they be Greeks [Heathens] who doubt of these things, We can answer a thousand things. But what? Because there are some amongst them who put souls into Plants, and Fruit-trees, and Dogs. Tell me which is easier for a soul to recover its own body, or another? Again, there are others who says that fire shall catch them, that their garments shall arise, and their shooes; and no body laughs at them. And some introduce Atomes. But we have nothing to say to them. But to Believers, if we may call them believers who thus doubt, we shall say with the Apostle, All life is subject to corruption, all plants, all seeds. Seest thou not, &c. Here that eloquent Father expatiates in the mysteries and subtilties of nature, shewing how little we understand of them, and concludes this point thus: *But these things humane reason is to seek in. But when God works all things yield to him.* In another place he doubts, whether he be an Infidel or Christian, who calls in question the Resurrection: and the reason hereof is, because, as the power of God is infinite, so infinite wayes there are for his infinite wisdom to bring to pass his own pleasure, and to make good his words, in which he hath caused his servants to trust.*

Chrys. in 1  
Theti. Sermon. 7.  
Eth.



## C H A P. XIX.

*Of the most perfect effect of Christs Mediation, in the Salvation of Man. Several senses of Salvation noted. That Salvation is immediately after death to them that truly dye in Christ. And that there is no grounds in Antiquities or Scripture, for that midde state called Purgatory: the Proofs answered. Of the Consequent of Roman Purgatory, Indulgences: the novelty, groundlesness, and gross abuse of them. The Conclusion of the first Part of this Introduction.*

Rom. 9. 23.

1 Pet. 1. 3.

**S**aint Paul, where he disputes the manner of Gods free Election of his people to the grace of the Gospel, doth also declare unto us the end of such Election to be another Election, and that to glory, as in these words, *That he might make known the riches of his glory [of Grace] on the vessels of mercy which he had before prepared unto glory.* This is yet more fully expressed by St. Peter in this order: *Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, which according to his abundant mercy hath begotten us again to a lively hope, by the Resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead: To an inheritance incorruptible and undefiled, and that fadeth not away, reserved in heaven for you, who are kept by the power of God through faith unto salvation, ready to be revealed in the last time.* But before we engage far in this subject of Salvation, it is requisite we observe a twofold Salvation frequently mentioned and promised in Scripture: A *Temporal* and *Eternal*. For herein common mistakes have surpris'd many, who willing to amplifie and extend all the promises of Gods deliverance, equally to us of this last Age of the Church, and to them of the former, and Apostolical, do willingly interpret many places of Scripture peculiar to them, as concerning us to: which cannot be literally done; though figuratively it may. For the Church of Christ being in those first Ages in continual conflicts with her enemies, Jewish and Gentile; and most violent persecutions harrasing and wasting the tender body of the Infant-Church, many weak Christians were of desponding minds, and looked upon the same as Job upon natural man, as having a short time to live, and full of sorrows: Which moved the Apostolical Writers to confirm the Hope and Faith of them by the assurances of deliverances

verance and salvation. And none can deny this to be the literal meaning of St. Paul in his eighth Chapter to the *Romans*; from whence so many draw an Argument to prove the innumerable purpose of God towards particular persons, in predestinating and electing and glorifying them; when, upon faithful examination, nothing more was primarily intended then assurance of Gods temporal preservation of the Church, and making it outwardly glorious in despite of all its adversaries: so that none should separate the flock of Christ so far from the love of Christ, by persecution; tribulation, distress, or famine, or nakedness, or peril, or sword; but that, at length, it should be more than conquerer, through him that loved it. And that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor things present, nor things to come, &c. should cause God to forsake it. And no other is the meaning of the same Apostle in his thirteenth Chapter to the *Romans*, where he saith: *And that knowing the time, that now it is high time for us to awake out of sleep, for now is our salvation nearer than when we believed; i. e. having continued thus long in the faith, the time now draweth near, we should be secured and saved from our enemies.* And the Salvation to be revealed in the last times spoken of by St. Peter, was the Deliverance, which, at last, should be manifested to the Church; in constant expectation of which they were kept by Faith and confidence of Gods mercy. And if we shall consult the Apocalypse, we shall scarce find the word Salvation used in any other sense then that of temporal deliverance of Gods Church. But withal, most certain it is, that by Salvation, is very often intended by Gods word, the deliverance from the miseries of sin, and suffering in this world, into a state of such perfect bliss, as man is capable of: in which sense St. Paul saith, *The Gospel is the power of God unto salvation.* And that, *with the mouth confession is made unto Salvation*; which salvation was, in those dayes, the destruction of them that confessed Christ. For St. Paul, to animate the weak Believers to a stout and resolute profession of Christ, against the terrors of death, threatening those that were known to be Christians, tells them; that if they so boldly confessed Christ with their mouth as to dye in that profession, they should be saved. And when St. Paul advises the *Philippians* to *work out their salvation with fear and trembling*, he means, without doubt, Eternal Life. And that Eternal Life which, to the *Romans*, he calleth the Gift of God. Of which Life St. John speaks thus, *This is the record that God hath given unto us eternal life; and this life is in his Son.* And St. Paul more expressly to the *Colossians*: *For ye are dead, and your life is hid with Christ: When Christ who is our life shall appear, then shall ye also appear with him in glory.* So that nothing is more frequent in Scripture then that Christ is the Authour of Eternal Salvation to all them that obey him: as it is in the Epistle to the *Hebrews*; and that he is the *Authour and finisher of our Faith*; The Authour of it, in Grace; and Finisher of it, in Glory; the perfection and consummation of Grace. Of the thing therefore, no dispute can be justly raised, but of the manner, some differences there are; and they principally about the possession of that bliss, or the fruition of it; or, the time when it first entred into, and, when it is in its full perfection.

And as touching the latter, it is with greatest probability affirmed, That, although there be such a free and full participation of the Divine Vision, whereby the Spirits of the deceased and truly and abundantly happy, yet there remains somewhat to be added thereunto, from the conjunction of the body, once companion to the soul, in all good and evil, of the passed Life.

Rom. 13. 11.

Rev. 7. 10.  
12, 10. 19, 11.

Rom. 1. 16.

Phil. 2. 12.

Rom. 6. ult.  
1 John 5. 11.  
Col. 3. 3, 4.Hebr. 5. 9.  
12. 2.

Ephes. 6.8.

2 Cor. 5.10.

For as at the general Resurrection the souls of the damned shall have their torments augmented upon the re-union of the body, once combining with the soul in sin; so at the same time, there being a conjunction of the soul and body of the just, there shall likewise be an increase of felicity and glory. *St. Paul intimateth thus much where he saith, Knowing that whatever good thing a man doth, the same shall he receive of the Lord, whether he be bond or free.* And yet more particularly to the *Corinthians: For we must all appear before the Judgment Seat of Christ, that every one may receive the things done in his body, according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad.* So that the body, as well as the soul, shall have the like proportion of reward or retribution, as they had in sinning, or doing well together. Of which we forbear here to enlarge, as not at all questioning the vertue and sufficiency of Christs merits, as the former seems to do.

For if the Grace of Gods Spirit, the course of righteousness duly run, by the servant of God, the Merits of Christs Death and Passion be not efficacious to the thoroughly purging of the soul and conscience of the faithful in this life, somewhat derogatory, not to the person only of man, but performance of Gods Spirits, and Christs merit applied certainly to the soul, seems to be reflected. The sufficiency of Christs salvation is such, that, by confession of all, it may avail to the acquitting from all the affections and circumstances of sin, such as pollution, guilt, and punishment; but it will not be granted that this actually is done in this life, or were ordained to such an end generally: For I suppose that they who have raised and maintained such an opinion, do not deny the sufficiency of Christs merits, and Gods mercy to sanctify every faithful person, to the putting him into a capacity of heaven, and that immediately after this life; for they directly affirm, that some eminent Saints, and particularly Martyrs for Christ, do forthwith pass from hence to absolute bliss; but they deny that all that are in a state of Grace, and are predestinated by God unto everlasting life, are so fully cleansed from the contagion and impurities, which even Venial sins taint them with, that they need not another expurgation before they can be admitted into the presence of God.

The faith of the ancient Churches (as in few words we shall shew) and of all, but such as profess subjection unto the Roman, hold that though no man ordinarily lives without sin, nor at the instant of his death is so absolutely pure, as to be fit to behold the face of God, who can endure no iniquity, and with whom no unclean thing shall dwell; yet by passing from this life into another, so far is the evil remitted by Gods mercie in Christ, so far accepted in Christ, is that person that dyes in a state of Grace, and reconciled to God, that he passes immediately from this mortal and miserable state here, to an immortal and less miserable, yea blessed, though not to the height, yet far exceeding all happiness competent to the children of God, during this life.

The demonstration of this our opinion, though very true, we must confess to be difficult, by reason of an evasion and shift always at hand, to elude our proofs. For when we bring testimonies direct out of Scripture of the happiness of Gods servants after this life; they answer presently, that they are to be understood either of eminent Saints, which are presently accepted into Gods presence; or of their designation to bliss, though they be not presently possessed of it; which must be acknowledged to be a kind of happiness, compared at least, with the wickeds condition, which after death is irreparable. But these notwithstanding, and certain others, we shall take notice of by and by, we declare positively, that for this doctrine of Purgatory,



tory, there is not any ground of Scriptures, Reason, or Antiquity : but on the contrary, all these are sufficient evidences to the contrary. For if the thing be so material a point in our Religion, as it is said to be, we hold the Scripture to be so entire a Rule of our belief, as that it must of necessity have been contained in it : but there is no foundation in it for that, as we shall see by and by. And on the other side, there are these arguments in it, against it.

First, saith *Solomon*, *Whatsoever thy hand findeth to do, do it with thy might, for there is no word or devise, nor wisdom nor knowledge in the grave, whether thou gnest.* Doth not this place plainly speak of the fixt and immoveable estate of the life to come ? And can that be counted less than ridiculous which is answer'd at the best rate, That there is nothing that a man can better himself in ; but others, by their piety, may better them ? Or that though in Purgatory they cannot help themselves, yet by the good works done before they came there, they may be benefitted ? Who denies but the Faith and Good works of men in this life, have singular influence upon mens future life, to the encrease of happiness ? But all this, we say, takes effect immediately upon the change of this mortal into immortal state. For who told them, that, to the application of the work to the wages, are required the suffrages of the living, or passions of the dead ?

Secondly, *St. John* in the *Revelations* clears this, saying, *Write, blessed are the dead which dye in the Lord from henceforth, for they rest from their labour, and their works follow them.* Their works follow them, without the least mention or insinuation of being vegetated and enabled so to do with the prayers of the living. And *they rest from their labours*, without being toyled, wasted, and tormented with worse miseries than ever they suffered upon earth. The evasion which is here borrowed from *Anselme*, upon the words (which yet in truth are no more *Anselm's* than the Comments under his name upon the Epistles, but *Hervens Natalis* his, living above two hundred years after *Anselme*) that here we are to understand the time of the Resurrection, might be accepted (for true it is, then shall the due reward be rendered to every mans works) if this excluded the other : For let our adversaries say whether all consideration of good works be deferred until the Resurrection ? Is it not in reference to them that some men are committed to Purgatory only, while others immediately go to hell ? That some mens pains in Purgatory are gentle and light, others more grievous ? and some mens shorter, and some longer, even of themselves without the help of their friends upon earth ? Why then must we needs understand this following of good works to be at the day of Judgment only, and not in just proportion, the whole time going before ? And therefore is that elusion we touched, of being meant of perfect Men and Martyrs, only rested on as the surer of the two, and that from *De Victore* and *Haymon*. It is true he doth speak of such : but it can only be said, and not proved, that he speaks of such only. *Dying in the Lord* being of far greater extent, and not upon mens pleasures, and the exigencie of a corrupt cause limited. But distrust that these devices will not satisfie, hath driven a great Champion of this Purgatory into another plainer, but much more absurd answer of his own ; viz. That some men dye absolutely in the Lord, as Martyrs, &c. and some men partly in the Lord, and partly not in the Lord : This is congruous indeed to the opinion resolved to be maintained ; and belike, *St. Augustine* gives ground hereunto : who in a certain Epistle saith that some men in this life are partly the Sons of Christ, and partly the Sons of this world.

world. This *Augustine* might speak, in reference to the imperfection of the state of Grace and Sonship here, which will admit of some mixture of worldliness and weakness, with Grace and Sanctification; but doth St. *Augustine* any where say, that, upon this any man is partly the child of God, and partly the child of the Devil, at the same time? or that at the same time he is in a state of Grace and a state of Sin? or reconciled to God, and not reconciled? This is a new invention; but very suitable to the third state after this life, Purgatory, and both of equal truth.

The place of *Ecclesiastes* — *Where the tree falleth there it shall be*, brought against a middle state, I confess hath besides the most natural sense, a sense which may be aimed at, besides the denial of any middle state, but that by indifferent interpreters it hath been applied to the immutableness of mans state, at his death, is certain. For in truth Purgatory, as commended to us, is a quite different state from that of bliss: as a state of torment must be from a state of bliss.

1 John 1. 7.  
John 5. 24.

Fourthly, The Holy Scriptures teach us that; *The blood of Jesus Christ cleanseth us from all our sins*: and that *He that heareth Christs word, and believeth on him that sent him, hath everlasting life, and shall not come into death, but is passed from death unto life*. And we may note, that *Life* simply taken, is never used for any other state but that of happiness, in holy Scripture: and therefore these two states only being mentioned in Scripture, it is sufficient to conclude that no more are to be added. For were it so, that nothing in Scripture were directly spoken against this opinion, it would no more avail the defenders of it, then it would any other Heretical Invention, which might be yet framed without any direct opposition from thence.

Now the Scriptural reasons against this we make to be these, in brief. First, that as well Scripture, as Philosophy, to which they assent who introduced these Purgative Flames, truly hold that all spiritual purgation and sanctification must have the consent and co-operation of the will, to produce any spiritual effect in the soul; but the Will after death elects not, merits not, nor demerits, *i. e.* deserves neither good nor evil, but is fixed to the state in which it is. But if sin be remaining in the separate soul, it must necessarily have its seat principally in the will; which is the formal principle of all good and evil. And there can be no change in the will of the deceased, as to the choice of good or evil simply; but only as to the more full and absolute captivating of the same, in the admiration of good or pertinacie in evil. Therefore the Prayers of the living not having, any influence upon the will or affections, at that time, to change them for the best, or correct the pravity of them, cannot avail to the meliorating of the soul in reference to its sanctity or impurity.

Again, No corporeal cause can be effectual upon the spirit of Man immediately, while it is disjoyned from the body, to the cleansing of spiritual stains: But the reliques of sin are spiritual and not corporal pollutions; and therefore no flames of Purgatory can mundifie the soul, so as to render it more innocent and fit for heaven. But the flames of Purgatory are sensible and properly material. And it is not said that the suffrage of the living obtain remission of sins for the afflicted in Purgatory, but only deliver them from punishments there suffered.

Thirdly, All sins being committed in the person of a Man consisting of body and soul, must be accounted for as they were acted in the Person, and not only in the one Part of him: neither can any  
fin

sin be said to be forgiven the soul, without the body, which was committed in soul and body together: nor can the soul be purged, and not the person, nor the person and not the body; but the body lies unconcerned & untouched all this while, by such tormenting remedies; and therefore there is no probability of any such semi-purgation of the soul, which should avail to the benefit and salvation of the whole. And therefore the souls of the damned suffering the pains of Hell fire, immediately after their departure from the body, are not awhit the better for what they suffer. Neither can this be alledged to invalidate the other, because, that in God punishing the souls of the Reprobates without their bodies, is no injustice, but rather a favour, deferring the punishment of it (who might have inflicted it upon both presently) until his own appointed time. But it can neither be understood nor believed, how that pravity, shot, or guilt, which equally inflicted both parts of man, should be removed and cleared upon the suffering of one, or applications made to it only.

Fourthly, All satisfactions must be proportionable to the wrong and offence in the subject, at least, if not manner of them. But Offenses are committed in the body as well as soul: Therefore must the satisfaction likewise be answerable, if at all made; and there is no ground to suppose that God should assign any such remedy of personal error, which concern one part of man only.

Fifthly, Either a man dyes in Repentance or Impenitencie: If in Impenitencie, then he hath no benefit of Purgatory, according to Romanists: If in true Repentance, then are all his sins so far cleansed and remitted, that there is no need at all of Purgatory: which is apparent from the very nature of Repentance: which is generally agreed to be a *Second Baptism*: Now, as Baptism washeth away all sin originally, so that the person dying instantly upon it, directly passes to Heaven; in like manner must it be in the Baptism of Repentance; all actual sins must be forgiven, and none remain to be punished or purged.

This is granted with this exception, provided we take Repentance entirely, in all its parts; whereof satisfaction (they say) is one; which being not thoroughly made on earth, must be completed in Purgatory. But to this (passing by the dispute of satisfaction which is corrupted notoriously by the same persons) we answer as before, that all satisfaction which can be accepted, must be attended with the change of the Will of the person, and be an act of the person; and therefore this called *Satisfaction*, in Purgatory being no act, and having no concurrence of the Will of the Person, the body being separate from the soul, can no wayes supply the defects of satisfaction in this world: and therefore if there be any, it must be before the divorce of body and soul. Whereupon *St. Augustine*, (who is confidently, but vainly alledged as a Patron of this Purgatory fire) saith thus: *Furthermore there is no place of amending manners but in this life: for hereafter every man shall have what he in this life procured to himself.*

*In Purgatorio non posse animas mereri aut peccare. Bellarm. de Purgat. lib. 2. c. 2.*

*Aug. Epist. 54.*

And now in brief to take notice of the grounds maintaining the Affirmative, we answer first to the Scriptures, which *Valentia* makes but four, of any considerableness; though others, by Metaphors and Allegories, multiply them to no purpose. First we must note, that however the Old Testament is made use of to confirm this; yet the more sincere and sober wholly wave all authorities and examples from thence: and so shall we. Nay, there are some who altogether decline as well the New as Old Testament:



ment: as doth *Petrus Soto*, not finding any thing to the purpose; but would not have us much wonder that nothing appears solid for it there, seeing many things are of Tradition without Scripture. Yet the most principal and colourable we shall try: which are these.

Matth. 12. 32.

First *Matthew* the Twelfth, v. 32. — *Whosoever speaketh against the Holy Ghost, it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world nor in the world to come.* Some sins are not forgiven in the world to come; therefore some are: And that must be in Purgatory. This is the sum of the Argument.

Ephes. 2. 7.

Heb. 6. 4, 5, 6.  
1c. 26.

Phot. Bibl.

But the consequence is not so good as it is taken to be. For it is frequent, by way of emphatical speech and aggravation, to put more into an argument than is really and strictly intended for true: as may by and by appear from such another Instance. But not to deny the validity of diverse answers given to it, I hold it best to make short work with it, and taking the word *World*, as meaning no more than to insinuate unto us, what in many other places the New Testament doth, a twofold Age of the Church of God; one under the Law of *Moses*, and the other under the Law of Christ. And plainly tells the spiteful and malicious Jews, that they who so reproachfully and incredulously spake of the Spirit of Grace manifesting it self to the world in miracles, could not expect to be forgiven such a notorious sin, either by virtue of the Law or Gospel; which then began to be published. And this state of the Gospel, the Apostle calls *the Ages to come*, in his Epistle to the *Ephesians*. And the like discrimination doth he make in that place to the *Hebrews*, if we compare his words in the sixth Chapter with them in the tenth, where he declareth against a possibility of salvation to such, who, when they *have once been illuminated and tasted the good things of heaven, if they shall fall away* [from their Baptism and profession of the Faith, in which they were once initiated and baptised] *to restore them again by repentance.* For to them remains no more Sacrifice for sins. By which he means not, as some have thought, that one hath apostatised from the Christian Faith, could never be restored again to Repentance, and become a good Christian, and in a possibility of salvation; but as *Enlogius Alexandrinus* in *Photius* hath it very literally and well. Such an one returning unto the Law of *Moses*, after he was enlightened or baptised, could not possibly hope for any Sacrifice there which should cleanse him from his sins. For though there was a possibility of salvation in the Law before Christ, to such as never were enlightened to the embracing of the Gospel, yet after Christ, such as became Christians and relapsed into Judaism, could not have any benefit from it: because they do in effect deny Christ, by whom they should be saved only.

1 Cor. 3. 13.

A second Text from whence *Valentia* would fetch Purgatory, and *Bellarmino* too (whom we here principally examine) is that of *St. Paul* to the *Corinthians*. *Every mans work shall be made manifest: For the day shall declare it, because it shall be revealed by fire, and the fire shall try every mans work, of what sort it is, &c.* Which words being, to *Bellarmin's* confession, of the hardest of all the Scripture, what great confidence can he or his fellows have in them? And why doth he call *Erasmus* Heretick, because he gives such an exposition of them as do make void the presumptions supposed to be very strong for Purgatory and Venial sins, when he acknowledges such obscurity in them? Indeed *Erasmus* his Notes do plainly overthrow both those imaginary Doctrines, supposed  
to

to be founded hereon : and I might spare any farther trouble, but yet shall put in my opinion of them ; which I take to be grounded upon these two things ; first, the most apt connexion between it and the context before and following these words. For it is most certain that the Apostles aim was to discover and oppose false teachers, start up to the prejudice of the true Apostles of Christ, and laying at least in shew another foundation of faith than Christ had laid ; or building otherwise upon St. Pauls foundation than became them. Now what think we ? doth St. Paul abruptly leave the subject he was treating of, and the persons he was confuting of, and warning the Corinthians against, and pass to the Doctrine nothing at all depending upon what went before or after, of Purgatory ? Or if he did not altogether desert his subject, but (as may be granted by them) declare what would be the end of such Doctours or Doctrines after they were all dead and gone, would this satisfie the expectation of such who stood in need of present advice and directions to secure themselves from such Impositions ? Surely no. St. Paul therefore doth certainly in this Metaphorical or Allegorical manner apply himself to the present state of the *Corinthians*, whom he adviseth to beware of such dangerous teachers. And how doth he this ? First, under the Metaphor of a Workman, insinuating the teacher himself. Secondly, under the Metaphor of a piece of Work, figuring the Doctrines taught and instilled into men. Thirdly, by *Fire*, certifying the manner of discerning the true Doctrine from the false : and that fire is afflictions and persecutions, which then were actually on the Church, but were soon after like to fall more heavily on it. Fourthly, by *hay, stubble, wood*, he means corrupt and erroneous Doctrines ; by *gold, silver, precious stones*, sincere and sound Doctrine. Now collect we all into one, and can any man desire any plainer and more current consonance between the figurative speech (as most infallibly this is) and the proper intention of the Apostle. I have begun amongst you, O *Corinthians*, to preach Christ, I have laid the foundation of saving Faith, like a wise Master-builder : yet there are some who building partly upon my Doctrine, and partly laying another foundation of their own heads ; when in very truth there can be no other foundation laid by any man than that is already laid by me, which is Jesus Christ. Now if any man build upon this foundation thus laid, gold, silver, precious stones, wood, hay, stubble ; that is, sound or unsound ; ye shall know which Doctrine is as gold, silver, and precious stones, sound and valuable ; and which as wood, hay, and stubble ; that is, refuse and corrupt. For the day shall declare it. What day ? The day of tryal. What tryal ? the tryal by fire : for the fire shall try every mans work of what sort it is. But what fire ? The fire of Persecution, or fiery tryal, as St. Peter speaks. And this is the second ground of this interpretation, taken from the frequency of this phrase, Fire, signifying in Scripture no more than afflictions or persecutions ; which may convince us of the true acceptation here. Christ in the Gospel of St. Luke saith, *I am come to send fire on the earth, and what will I, if it be already kindled ?* And that this fire was no other than persecutions and troubles, with which the followers of Christ were to contend and struggle, is manifest from the following words. And Tertullian taking occasion to speak of those words, saith, *Ipse melius interpretabitur ignis illius qualitatem, &c.* He [Christ] himself explains better the condition of that fire, *Do ye think that I came to send peace on*

1 Pet. 1. 7.

Pſalm 66. 12.

the earth? St. Peter commeth much nearer to our present case, where he saith: *That the tryal of your faith being much more precious than of gold that perisbeth, though it be tryed with fire, might be found unto praise, and honour, and glory at the appearance of Jesus Christ.* The Psalmist saying, *Thou hast caused men to ride over our head: we went through fire and through water, &c.* what can we understand but afflictions? And no need of any more instances to the purpose; *i. e.* either to show in general, that Fire in holy Scripture imports afflictions, or that so it is here with St. Paul used. Yet the words immediately following agree so exactly with it, that it is yet farther put out of question, what should be the meaning of the former; *viz. If any mans work abide which he hath built thereupon, he shall receive a reward. If any mans work shall be burnt, he shall suffer loss: but he himself shall be saved, yet so as by fire.* That is; if any man hath so built upon the foundation, Christ Jesus, as his work abides the tryal, and so be found good and laudable, then he shall have his due reward for his pains: But if otherwise, his work shall be burnt: that is, upon tryal not be found as gold and silver which cometh out of the fire better and purer: but Persecutions and Examinations shall reveal or manifest it to be dross, vain, and corrupt; then shall such an one suffer loss, he shall have lost his labour, and his reputation, yet may we not despair of him: For however he be found defective in his Doctrines, yet himself may be saved upon his repentance, so as by fire: *i. e.* by having passed himself through such persecutions as may bring him to the sincere profession of the Faith, though his erroneous Doctrines perish, and come to nought. And to this sense of the Apostle do I stick, though I am not ignorant how diversly he is interpreted by as well Ancient as Modern Divines: to whom to be tyed, when they are so dissonant, were too hard measure: especially when the simplicity of a literal sense offers it self so fairly as here: and the greatest part of the expositions agree hereunto.

1 Cor. 15. 29.

*Hic locus aperte convincit quod volumus si bene intelligatur. Bellar. de Purg. l. 1. c. 6.*

Thirdly, It is not very strange that the words of St. Paul elsewhere to the Corinthians, should be drawn this way too? *viz. What shall they do that are baptized for the dead?* and that (as he that alledges them, saith) *manifestly making for what they would have them*, when as immediately he brings six several senses given of them? Can they then be so very plain? He well therefore adds, *If they be rightly understood.* And when are they rightly understood according to him? Not until they make for Purgatory. It were too tedious and polemical to refute all brought for the vindicating these words to the use of Purgatory, or to contend about the sense of them, farther then what Epiphanius long since hath, with great judgment and simplicity, lead us too: which I profess to adhear to, and with which most imaginary senses are answered. For, says he, *there were a certain sort of Hereticks crept into the Church in St. Pauls dayes, which maintained such a necessity of Baptism to be saved, that they would baptize their friends after their death; supposing that by proxie a man might receive the benefit of Baptism. And yet some of these denied the Resurrection.* Now St. Paul argues thus, *If there be no Resurrection of the dead, to what end do they baptize the living instead of the dead? what can it avail them, according to their own judgments and opinions? And thus what becomes of Purgatory?*

But



But lastly, The words of Christ in St. *Matthew* and St. *Luke* agree with, &c. *Verily, I say unto thee, thou shalt by no means come out thence till thou hast paid the uttermost farthing?* are thought of no mean force to infer a Purgatory. But alas, such havock do men make, who would so have it, of the words, such hooks and tenters do they apply to wring and draw them to their purpose, so do they play fast and loose with Antiquity about them, that a man had need be well settled in a persuasion of the thing it self before he can brook such a reason as this affords. The plain and simple sense therefore shall suffice to ward off all force against it, *viz.* That Christ meant no more than they who made not their peace and reconciliation with God before they go out of this world, shall be cast into Hell, from whence they shall never return until they have paid all the punishment they ow to God for their sins, to a farthing, that is, absolutely satisfied, which by a Periphrasis, or in many words as much as to say in one *Never*. Besides, they that are such stout defenders of the Virgin *Maries* perpetual Virginity against the ill sense given by *Helvidius* and his followers of those words in St. *Matthew*, *Until she had brought forth her First-born*; know very well how to give another sense to *Until*, then a certain inference of somewhat to ensue that Period so fix'd: and that it implies not necessarily that ever such payment of the utmost Farthing shall be made: but upon supposition that it be paid, such event as is there mentioned should follow.

But Antiquity, and that of both Eastern and Western Churches are, is alledged in confirmation of the present Roman Purgatory. To which we oppose this assertion, That Purgatory, as now defended, was never heard of in the Latin Church for four hundred years together after Christ, nor received into it with common approbation until six hundred years after Christ: *Austin* began to doubt of it, and is scarce constant to himself in it. *Gregory* the Great set it up upon its leggs and advanced it far, if so be that the Dialogues bearing his name were truly his, as 'tis most probable they are not, or that they are corrupted. For how could *Gregory* who flourished about the year of our Lord 590. and was succeeded by *Boniface* the third about the year 606. take notice of *Justinian* the elder, as elder, unless he had known *Justinian* the younger, who was Emperour about the year 685. long after the true *Gregory* was dead. But from about that time this erroneous opinion got footing, and began to spread, but was never thoroughly settled in the Church of *Rome* it self until the time of *John* the Seventeenth, or as others compute it, the Nineteenth, about the year 1003, when he instituted the Feast of *All-Souls*, in which men were enjoined to pray for the deliverance of Souls out of Purgatory. But the Council of *Florence*, in the year 1439. put it out of all future dispute, when it decreed it so to be. But the Greeks, who were there present, refused that sense, however they gave way to the Name Purgatory. Neither do they admit it unto this day, so vain and bold a task doth *Bellarmino* undertake, with other Pontificians to bring (and that of old) the Greek Church to consent with the Latin herein: upon whose attempts we find modern Assertours of the Roman Cause to call them to witness too, and when diligent search proves prejudicial to them, to bring *Osiander* (a man of small judgment, and no command of his passions in his free censures of Antiquity, wherever his History leads him to observe any thing there which he likes not, and many times understands not) and Sir *Edwin Sands*, a Gentleman of excel-

Marth. 5. 25.  
26.  
Luke 12 58.

Greg. M. Dial.  
l. 3. c. 2.

lent abilities as an Historian: but finding the word Purgatory among Grecian Authours of modern times, concluded that it was the same with the Roman; but was much mistaken. For 'tis well known some modern Greeks, as *Nilus Thessalonensis*, have writ purposely against the Roman Purgatory.

And this will farther appear from the two general defects running through almost all the Arguments brought by Romanists to prove Purgatory from the ancient Fathers and Councils of both Churches: which being noted may suffice for Answers to them in this point, especially in this place. For first, they argue from the word Purgatory, wherever they find it in Greek and Latin Fathers. But Purgatory fire with them was quite another thing from that now in credit amongst us. *Origen* (and he the first that we meet with) invented a Purgative fire, and divers Fathers catching at that, discoursed dubiously upon that subject: but with this Fivefold difference from Roman Flames. First, They exempted no man from this Purgation, not Saints or Martyrs, but supposed all should be purged before they entered entirely into Heaven: the modern Purgatory frees eminent Saints from that fiery tryal. Secondly, They held this purgation principally useful to the purification of the gross matter of the body to a finer substance, before it could be meet to enter into heaven, together with the soul: but these make it to seize principally, if not only, on the soul separate from the body, and to cleanse that. Thirdly, They never intended theirs to purge off the stain of sins, or satisfy for what souls were behind in, going out of this world; but the Romanists affirm and defend it in this sense. Fourthly, They never maintained any immediate purgation or torments from the departure of the soul from the body: but affirmed only a general and momentaneous transmutation by Fire, at the Day of Judgment, to be fitted the better for Heaven. Fifthly, They never imagined that the Prayers of Living did relieve the miseries of the afflicted in Purgatory, as do these: or that there was any such passing from that state to Heaven before the Day of Judgment. And what need we travel on this subject, when we have the testimony of chief men against them herein? *Rolfensis Artic.* 18. against *Luther*, says directly, *Amongst the Ancient there is little or no mention made of Purgatory: and that the Greek to this day hold it not.* The very same says *Alphonsus de Castro contr. Heret. lib. 8. tit. De Indulgentia.*

But the second Argument of Romanists will clear this, drawn out of many Fathers to prove they held Purgatory because they held Prayer for the dead, of which Prayer none (they suppose) can be capable, but such as are in this middle state, between Heaven and Hell. But we deny not that the Ancients prayed for the Dead, nor do we dissent much from them in that pious act our selves (however there are quarrellers amongst us, well known by their other affected and morose follies, who oppose it, because they have no express Scripture for it) but we deny they ever prayed for the pardon of their sins, or ease of torments, so anciently; but for an happy rest and restauration in a Resurrection. So that we peremptorily deny (and well may notwithstanding all proofs brought to the contrary) that Prayer for the Dead necessarily infers Roman Purgatory.

And for the Consequence of this Opinion of Roman Purgatory, Indulgences, it is so rank a Corruption, such a novel and impudent invention,

tion, as the Church of *Rome* under that defection it now is, never did so great a miracle as to get it any place in sober and knowing mens minds; both thing it self, and the abuse of it being such as alone may suffice to disgrace the Authours of it, and make their pretenses to infallibility, alwaies false, very ridiculous. We know indeed that scarce any thing was of ancients use in the Church then some Indulgences; but no more like these, than Earth is like Purgatory. Indulgences were made by such who were in authority in the Church towards Penitents, who had their Penances allotted them, for scandalous Crimes committed against the Faith and Church: which Penances were often relaxed and mitigated by the favour and indulgences of the Fathers of the Church, good cause appearing for to do so. But that ever it was in the power of the Church to give ease to such as were punished in that other Life to come; was never heard of for above a thousand years after Christ. *Alphonsus de Castro* is worth the reading upon this, who is positive for Indulgences, but going about to prove them, prepares his Reader with a long Preface for such a short Discourse, telling him that, *He ought not to expect for all points of Faith, Antiquity, or expresse Scripture.* For many things are known to the moderner, which those ancient Writers were altogether ignorant of. For seldome any mention is made in ancient Writers of the transubstantiation of the Bread into Christs Body: of the Spirits proceeding from the Son, much rarer: of Purgatory, almost none at all, especially among Greek Writers, for which reason Purgatory is not believed of the Greek to this day, &c. — The ancient Church caused men to satisfie in this life, and would leave nothing to be punished in the Life to come, and therefore there is no mention of Indulgences. Thus he: But adds, *Amongst the Romans, the use of them is said to be very ancient; as may in some manner be collected from their statious.* And it is reported of Gregory the First [of whom we even now spake] that he granted some in his dayes. It is said and reported: by where, and by whom, he could not tell us. But he tells us indeed how *Innocent* the Third, that great Innovator and Corrupter of the Church, constituted it in the Latherane Council, and the Council of Constance after that, much; which was not before the Year 1200. Judge we from hence, what great account is to be made of the many sayings of the Fathers pretended to approve this devise. And judge we farther, what great Reason or Scripture there is for the Popish faction to derogate so far as they do, from the efficacy of Gods Holy Spirit of Grace, in the repenting sinner, though straitened of time in the exercise and demonstration of his true Conversion; and from the fullness of Christs mediation and merits; which are ordained for the remission of all sins, upon true Repentance. *For the blood of Christ cleanseth from all sin*, saith St. *John*: and so say they, understood as in this Life and the Life to come: but St. *John*, nor any other holy Writer of Scripture, gives us the least intimation of any other season of pardon, then that of this Life.

Therefore here to end this First Part, with the end of Man in this world, seeing Gods Promises are so liberally revealed unto penitent sinners in this Life, without exceptions of matter, time, or place, of venial or mortal sins. Seeing Christs merits are absolutely sufficient to acquit the sinner, and no limitation is to be found, upon Faith and Repentance, in Scripture; Seeing lastly, that Gods Spirit of Grace is of vertue sufficient to sanctifie, to the washing away of all filthiness both of  
flesh

*Alphonsus de Castro lib. 8. Adv. Hær. de Indulg.*



2 Pet. i. 11.

flesh and spirit; and this life is only mentioned in Scripture for the exerting of this work, and perfecting this cure of the soul; Let us rather thankfully embrace *so great salvation, and work it out* (for St. Paul supposes we may) *with fear and trembling in this life*: that so, as St. Peter hath it, *An entrance may be ministred abundantly unto us, into the everlasting Kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.*

---

*The End of the First Part.*

THE  
Second Part  
OF THE  
INTRODUCTION

To the Knowledge of the  
True Catholick Religion.

CHAP. I.

*Of the worship of God, wherein the Second Part of Christian Religion consists. Of the Necessity of worshipping God. It is natural to worship God: Socinus holding the contrary, confuted. Of the Name of Religion; the Nature of religious worship, wherein it consisteth.*



Religion we have defined to be, A due Recognition and Retribution made by the Creature to God the Fountain of all Being, communicating himself freely to inferiour Beings: And this description we have in substance given us by *David*, in his last and most serious charge to *Solomon* his Son, saying; *And thou, Solomon my Son, know thou the God of thy Fathers, and serve him with a perfect heart, and with a willing mind,* &c. From whence we take the ground of our distinction of Religion into

*1 Chron. 28. 9.*

into two Parts. The true knowledge of God, which is attained by the Doctrine of Faith, revealed in Gods holy Word; and the worship of him therein likewise contained. Of the former having already spoken; we now proceed more briefly to treat of the second, *The worship of God.*

Sen. Epist. 95.

Cicero de  
Natura Deor.  
lib. 2.

And that God is to be worshipped, is such an inseparable notion from the acknowledgment of God, as nothing can follow more necessarily then that doth from this. And it were more reasonable (though that be brutish) for to deny God absolutely, then to deny him worship and service. And therefore *Seneca* saith well, *The first worshipping of God is to believe there is a God: The next, to yield to him his Majesty; to yield him his Goodness: to understand that he [for they] governs the world.* And afterward, *He sufficiently worships God who imitates him.* And *Tully*: *The worship of God ought to be most excellent, and pure, and holy, and full of piety, so that we may constantly worship him, with a pure, intire, and uncorrupt mind and voice.* And it is very wonderful (if any thing can be strange, which we find comming from that monstrous wit) that *Socinus* should profess Christianity, and yet deny that which common humanity taught others, as great wits as himself. For denying that Religion or Worship of God is natural to man, as in divers places he doth; what account can he give of many Heathen, who never heard of, or received any such revelations, as he holds necessary to make God known in the world? And why? because there are certain people in the *Indies* (saith he) which have no reverence of a Deity. But doth he think that nature teacheth us just so much as we actually know, and no more? It should seem so indeed, by his reasonings and conclusions. But that was his folly and mistake; as much as it would be to hold an opinion, that the Preacher of the Gospel doth not instruct or advise men in Religion, the knowledge and service of God, because they profit not by him; but live profanely and vitiously. For that we say is natural to us, and that we have by the Law and light of Nature, which we have so within us, as that by the help of them, we may arrive to the knowledge of the truth, not that, whether we will or no, we shall necessarily attain it. And surely it is but as the opening of the eyes of the body in a drowie person, to discern the light of the day, for a man to perceive such notices as these, by vertue of that natural light in him, and those legible Characters writ by Gods finger in the heart of man. He is franck enough to man, and more than enough, more then any good Christian, in magnifying mans natural reason, and natural freedom of will, and his power in choosing good and refusing evil, and living regularly without those Divine aids, judged necessary by all good Christians. But how can this be done without the acknowledgment of a Deity, and the worship of it? But it seems he must give place to *Tully* in Christianity, whose words are these, *In my judgment Piety is the Foundation of all Vertues*: which if true, as true it is, how can he hold that a man can have any one moral vertue, without devotion towards God? And can devotion to God be separated from the knowledge of God? There are, it may be, some Nations which are so inhumane and barbarous, as to regard neither truth nor justice. Doth it therefore follow they have no such seeds of both these sown in their heares, as are naturally apt, if not violently choaked, to increase to virtuous and laudable actions and habits? Many men, we see, lay violent hands on themselves, and take away their own lives: should any wise man then conclude from hence, Nature never taught him to preserve it?

Cicero pro  
Plancio.

It



It may further be argued for a naturalness in man to be Religious, and to agnize and worship a Deity, from the absolute necessity of it to the subsistence of humane society. Man is naturally sociable, saith the Philosopher: but without Religion, no Civil society can long or well hold together: and therefore, if Nature hath disposed man to the one, and this cannot be attain'd without the other, it will follow that the necessary means must in some manner be provided to that end, by the author of that first design: unless we will grant that too (as commonly one absurdity tumbles in upon the neck of another, as *Aristotle* observes) that nature designs things in vain.

Of this natural necessity of Religion, diverse have treated; whom I might imitate but that I study compendiousness and upon that reason instance no more than in the Original of the *Roman* Monarchy begun rudely and barbarously by *Romulus*; and so in all likelyhood to have suddenly vanished and expired; had not *Numa* stay'd and secur'd it by Religion, and the fear of the Gods, as is observed by *Florus*: *He brought a fierce people to that pass, that what they had by force and injustice possess'd themselves of, they should manage by Justice, and Religion.* And afterward, *What was more Religious than Numa? So the case required, that a fierce people should be softened by the fear of the God?*

*Florus Lib. 1.  
C. 2.  
Id. C. 8.*

We shall therefore take it for granted that Religion is, and ought to be in all persons: and amongst all people; and leaving the common Criticisms about the name Religion whether it proceeds from *Religando* as *Hierome* thinks, which implies a double obligation upon man towards God, natural and Moral or of Election, very commodiously: Or whether, as *St. Augustine*, it comes from *Religendo* Recognizing a Deity, not unfitly; we pass in a word to the Nature and proper Offices of Religion, as taken here for the worship of God. For so necessary and natural are these two general Parts of Religion we have laid down; Knowledge of God, and Worship of God; that some both Heathen as well as Christian Philosophers define it by each of them. *Epictetus* declares it *the primest thing in Religion, to have a Right Judgment of the Gods.* And *Mercurius* that it is [*γινώσκειν θεόν*] the knowledge which *Salvian* literally translates and uses as his definition. On the other side the Scholiast on *Aristophanes* saith, *He that is religious does those things that are pleasing unto God.* And *Tully*, where we above quoted him, describes it to be *The worship of God.* And *Guilielmus Parisiensis* describes it thus, *The sum of Religion is to persevere immoveably against all the provocations of temptations, and to ascend upward towards God, and inseparably to cleave to him.*

*Hier. in Amos  
C. ult.*

*Aug. Civit. de  
Lib. 10. 4.  
Enchirid. c.  
38. κυρίως  
ταύτην ἐστὶν ὁρ-  
θὰς ὑπακοήν  
πρὸς αὐτῶν ἔ-  
χην. Salvi-  
an. ad Cath.  
Eccl. lib. 2.  
Ὁ γὰρ Θεὸς  
σεβὲς ἐστὶν τῷ  
Θεῷ ἐστὶ φίλα  
ταῦτα πράτ-  
τει. Pan. c. 3.  
Paris C. 3.*

And surely that Question mov'd in the Schools, Whether Theology, or Religion be a speculative or Practical vertue, is never like to be decided until the different Parties agree to compound the matter by taking in both, and making it both *Speculative* and *Practical*, as we do. For undoubtedly, as it delivers rules and Articles of Faith, it is speculative; as it delivers Rules and precepts of Holy and divine Life, it is Practical, and both these it doth; as we have shew'd. But it is the practical part of it or worship we are at present concerned in; and of which no small doubt may be made, whether it consists more in the Fear or Love of God? but I suppose it may be, as be before said. It being an Affection of the Inward man consisting of Reverence and love of God, and demonstrating the same in Acts proper and proportionable thereunto. And this is all the definition needful to be given of Serving God, so essential that the word of

God doth nothing more frequently than put the fear of God simply, for the Service of God: *Abraham* saith in *Genesis*, *The Fear of God is not in this place.* The *Psalmist* saith, *They have no fear of God before their eyes.* St. *Paul* saith, *Perfecting holiness in the fear of God:* and elsewhere, *Submitting yourselves one to another in the fear of God.* All which, with many more places, import as much as Religious worship of God? And so doth the Love of God also: as in St. *Luke* our Saviour saith to the *Pharisees*, *Wo to you Pharisees for ye tithe Mint and Rue, and all manner of Herbs and pass over Judgment and the Love of God:* where Love of God stands for the true Service of God, and duely to him: as *Judgment* insinuates our duty towards our neighbour. And so St. *Paul* to the *Thessalonians*, *The Lord direct your hearts into the Love of God.* And St. *John* most frequently in all his writings. Leaving therefore this general consideration let us in this order inquire farther into, 1. The Parts. 2. The proper States of serving. 3. The special Kinds of Divine Worship.

## CHAP. II.

*Of the two parts of Divine Worship, Inward and Outward. The Proof of outward worship as due to God: and that it is both due, and acceptable to God. Several Reasons proving bodily worship of God agreeable to him. Wherein this Bodily worship chiefly consists. Certain Directions for Bodily worship. Exceptions against it answered.*

**B**Y what is expressed in our General description of Worship, it may appear that there are two Principal Parts of it: The one consisting in inward affection; and the other in the outward Actions. The inward disposition of the mind or soul of man is that on all hands is agreed upon as most justly due and proper to God alone in the supreamest manner: God calleth for the heart so often in his holy word as his proper portion; and the Spirit as that which draweth nearer to the nature of God, as purely spiritual and incorporeal. For God (saith Christ) *is a Spirit, and they that worship him, must worship him in Spirit and in Truth:* Though if we should take these words according to the prime intention, they would be found not to aim so much, if at all, at diverse manners of worship under the same kind: but at several kinds such as were the Judaical and Christian: the meaning of Christ being this, that the hour or time was coming when there should be no longer use of those corporal

corporal services and Sacrifices under the Law, but in lieu of them the spiritual and true worship of the Gospel should succeed. But no question can be made of the excellency of that true spiritual inward devotion of the heart and mind to God, as the most absolute, most required, most accepted: and in comparison of that, all outward worship being no better without it than gross Hypocrisie, rather incurs the displeasure of Almighty God than pleases him. Therefore, leaving that which all Christians are in their judgements sufficiently satisfied in, and hold themselves obliged unto; we shall take up the defence of the *outward worship*, in great manner opposed by too many.

And truly, They that argue so contemptuously and wildly, as the vulgar custome doth, against outward worship of God; shall not need to go far to see their own folly. For to say, *God is a Spirit*, and *'Tis the heart that God calls for*, and, *'Tis the zeal of the Soul*, and such like loose sayings, what do they but cut the throat as much of vocal prayer, and Preaching, as of any thing else? For if God will accept the heart, and looks no farther than the purity and good disposition of the mind, Audible Prayer, and Preaching must together with the rest be excluded, as impertinent in Gods service. We know that the prayer of the heart (as in the Case of *Hannah*) is accepted of God at some times, and in some places, as the true Love and Charity to our Neighbour inclining us to do him good and relieve him when it lies not in our power: but *St. James* looks on them and censures them as meer uncharitable mockers, and not relievers of their neighbours, who shall only pretend they mean them well inwardly, and say unto them, *Depart in peace, be ye warmed, and filled: notwithstanding ye give them not those things which are needful to the body*: Even so Faith, and so the will, and the heart, and the Spiritual worship without works are all dead, and are a meer mockery of the divine Majesty; a corrupting and perverting of his holy word, and a bitter *Sarcasm*, turning it against himself: and as much as if it should be said, Seeing you will needs have the heart you shall have it: that is so, as to have nothing more. It were superfluous and shameful to cite the many misunderstood and misapplied texts of Scripture to delude the most ignorant, and, at the same time, most presumptuous of Scripture. None speak more after the phrase which hath deceived so many, than that not long since quoted, *Wo be to you Pharisees, for ye tithe Mint and Rue, and all manner of Herbs, and pass over Judgment and the Love of God*. Doth not the Scripture here seem to condemn, and that under a curse, such little services as are there expressed? It seems so indeed, and really doth, as much as any outward worship of God: But it doth but seem so. For undoubtedly, it was most agreeable to it, that such minuter services should be perform'd, but that so performed as studiously and superstitiously to neglect the other more weighty, was it which incensed God against them.

And here comes in that general argument also, above touched: Fast from sin (say they) and for outward fasts it matters not: Wisely and profoundly said, like able Divines indeed. And so, fast or abstain from sin, and ye shall never need to pray, nor hear Sermons, nor to feed the Hungry, nor cloth the Naked; no, nor to believe in God: which is all such persons have left them of Religion starved into an inactiveness; Would it not make a mans Hair stand upright to see, and hear what precipices of Heathenism and follies Men dispute themselves into? And so they may (as they suppose) enjoy their lust of contradiction and contempt of others,

Jam. 2. 16.

Luk. 11. 42.



strike through the loins of all Reason and Religion, at the same time : Reason, which they set, by such sophistry as this, to fight against it self. For Serving of God in Spirit and in truth, and abstinence from all sins, as well of Omission as Commission, is the very perfection and end of all Religion. And if there were no more required but a simple command to do it, on Gods part, not directing us to the way : and no more on our part, but presently and immediately to become holy and perfect, without the proper means conducing to such high and not easie ends ; then forsooth, these Disputants were the best Councillors : but if there be outward means ordained in general by God, and applicable many times by humane prudence, to the effecting such ends, and that outward acts of worship are of this nature ; I only blush at the perverseness and folly of these men and so leave them. Yet out of pity towards some, who, like the *Israelites* after *Absolome*, are carried away from the truth in the innocency of their souls ; I shall endeavour to stay them by advising them to consider what *Perkins* writeth well in these words ; *Indeed all the worship of God is Spiritual, even that which we call outward, yet not of it self, but by vertue of the inward, from which it proceedeth.*

*Perkins Cases  
of Conscience.  
L. 2. C. 5.*

But were it not so, yet the worship of the Body it self is a real, and in some degree, an acceptable service unto God, even distinctly considered from that of the Mind ; as the same Author also confesses, upon this solid ground : *God is the Creatour not only of the soul of man, but also of the body, and we bless God not only with the heart, but also with the tongue. Therefore the whole man must pray in publick.* And who is it that grants what the *Psalmist* sayes, *All thy works praise thee, O Lord* : and denies not the body to be the workmanship of God, but must grant that the body is obliged to the worship of God, as really as the soul ? Doth not *St. Paul* say, *Glorifie God in your body, and in your spirit which are Gods* ? The Body and the Soul are both said to be Gods : and therefore are both to be rendred unto God, according to their ability and capacity : And it is no less ridiculous for men to deny bodily service to God, as unprofitable and unacceptable unto him, because God calls to earnestly for the spiritual and inward service of the mind, than it would be to deny God the inward worship of the Soul joined to the Body ; because it is said, *Worship him all ye Saints, and let the Angels of God worship him.* Whatsoever the idle and unprofitable servant saith in the Gospel of God that *he was an hard man reaping where he had not sown, and gathering where he strawed not*, yet it is nothing so. For God doth not require more than he hath given ; and therefore having given less to the Body than to the Soul, do we think he will accept of no less from the Body, than he doth from the soul ? The Parable now touched proves the quite contrary : God there, well rewarding less encrease and return, though not in the Arithmetical proportion, yet Geometrical. Put the Case, that the body hath received but as five talents, and the soul ten ; nay, that it hath received but one : yet the condemnation for not improving that one according to the cause and ground given, sufficiently evidence, that the improvement according to that ground, would be an occasion of praise and reward.

*Psalm. 145. 10*

*1. Cor. 6. 20.*

*Mat. 25. 24.*

And this Thirdly appears from the *peaceableness* of man in bodily Acts. For if the mind being well disposed to God, the Bodily outward acts are sometimes sinful as in the simulation of worshipping an Idol with outward acts when inwardly a man detests and abhors the same ; as certainly they are : then surely, though the mind be not so well devoted to God as it ought

## Part I. Of the Outward Acts of the Worship of God. 365

ought (provided it be not bent to the contrary) the outward acts may be acceptable in some degree to God. And therefore *Origen* hath these words, It is one thing to worship, and another to adore. A man may sometimes Adore unwillingly as they that flatter Kings, when they perceive they are addicted to that sort of Idolatry, do seem to adore [or fall down to] Idols. Whereas in their hearts they are well assured that an Idol is nothing. But to worship is with entire affection and addition to be subservient. if then a Man may offend God with his body, why may he not please him? Is it because God will according to his due have all, or none? This makes as much against the simplicity and singularity of the Souls worship as the bodies, and no more.

*Origen Hom. 8.  
in Exod.*

Fourthly, the Scripture giving us precepts of outward worship, and precepts of Gods rewarding bodily ceremonies of worship; doth abundantly commend the same unto us. *St. Paul* saith to the *Corinthians*, *Providing for honest things not only in the sight of the Lord, but also in the sight of men.* Christ saith, *Let your works so shine before men that they may glorify your Father which is in heaven.* And again *St. Paul* to the *Thessalonians* saith, *Abstain from all appearance of Evil.* And to the *Romans*, *Provide things honest in the sight of all men.* All which words may be interpreted of moral works, but not so as to exclude the outward bodily Acts of Reverence and worship of God, which are apt to affect or disaffect men. And the reason hereof is because of all the worship and glory we exhibit to Almighty God, nothing more accreth really unto him than external esteem. For it is as true of the Glory of God, as Man, with the change of persons, *It is the Judgement of Men thinking well of men* (and so of God) saith *Austin*: or as *Gulielmus Parisiensis*, *Glory is nothing else, but an excellent, high, and far spread fame.* By which it appeareth, that all Glory is a thing rather Relative, than absolute, and depending on the opinion of men. 'Tis confessed, there is an absolute Glory, and essential of God with himself: but we give not that to him, but only publish, and celebrate the same: and this we do chiefly by outward acts or bodily. And do we not read in *Josuah* how *Achan* is said to give glory unto God, in open confession of his sins? And doth not the Scripture plainly affirm that *Ahab* was accepted of God, so far as to the mitigating of the sentence pronounced against him, by God; *Because he humbled himself before God.* And what was his humiliation, but the outward ceremonious acts of Repentance; as Renting his clothes, putting sackcloth upon his Flesh, fasting, lying in sackcloth, going softly. Which will be of greater force if it be true what some modern interpreters say of these things, That they were all hypocritically done.

*2 Cor. 8. 21.*

*Mat. 5.*

*1 Thes. 5. 22.*

*Rom. 12. 17.*

*Aug. Civit. Dei  
L. 5.  
Gul. Paris. de  
Fide, C. 3.*

*Jos. 7. 19.*

*1 King 21. 27.  
29.*

Fifthly, External worship and reverence are not only so many indications and Effects of the more noble, and divine worship of the Soul, and fruits which are as acceptable as the tree that bears them: but which is much more, they are very often causes of the devotion of the mind, and great inflamers of the affections, as well of him that so demeans himself in humility and reverence, as of the beholder: Of this latter *St. Paul* speaks, in his epistle to the *Corinthians*, where he treats of the external decency, and order, to be observed in the worship and House of God; upon which he that cometh in falling down on his face (which is one of those outward Acts we here mean) *I will worship God, and report that God is in you of a truth.* And in his Second Epistle he saith, *Your zeal hath provoked very many,* Which zeal was manifested in external works. And who may not observe, not

*1 Cor. 14. 25.*

*2 Cor. 9. 12.*

only

only an *Influence* of the inward affections moving the outward parts: but a *Reffluence* (as one may say) of such outward acts upon the inward faculties, to the exciting them. And that speaking cholerically doth not only proceed from a principle of Angeriness, but augments the passion inward; and so in love and zeal, in matters as well divine, as prophane, acting humility and devotion outwardly, doth wonderfully excite those graces in the inward man.

I shall add but one more argument to beget a better opinion of external and bodily services in Gods worship, than vulgarly prevails: And that is, The general practice of the ancientest and best Christians, I say, best Christians and purest and perfectest worship of God; in open defiance of them of late times, who insolently magnifie themselves and modern inventions, to the contempt of their much superiours in piety and years. They had many outward rites and ceremonies adorning the worship of God; which I prefer infinitely before the fowre and severe nakedness of Gods service amongst them. 'Tis not to be denied, that in process of time, Ceremonies multiplied to the prejudice of Religion; but I think scarce at any so much, as the affected prophaneness hath on the other side, dammified it. And they that argue from the great opinion some have of Ceremonies, to the total abolition of them, put an argument into the mouths of others to renounce communion with them that hate them, and detest them to that superstitious excess, as to have none at all: and by the same rule, to love them, because they detest them who have been so scandalous in their opposition to them.

Now this external Worship we here plead for, is an Adoration of God: An humiliation of the Body by external Acts, and gestures, upon the consideration and reverent esteem of the Divine Presence; and the small and low esteem we have of our selves: which is so necessary and natural that it is to be admired how the contrary carriage could ever be received as pleasing to God or man; were it not that the Tempter to irreligion knoweth no shame: nor they who are abused by him, and his Instruments, no mean in flying Extrems. What is more frequent in Scripture than examples of such as thus humbled themselves before God? Falling down in Scripture (which necessarily is bodily Adoration) hath been alwayes such an inseparable concomitant of Divine inward worship, such an excellent part of it, that by a current Synecdoche it is put for the worship of God entirely and absolutely. For what else may we understand by that Prophetical speech of Christ. *All Kings shall fall down before him, all nations shall worship.* And so in the Prophet *Esay*, *Shall I fall down to the stock of a tree?* That is, worship it in this bodily manner. And so in the next Chapter: and the 46. Chapter. *They fall down yea they worship:* by which words the Prophet condemns the Idolatrous practise then in use. And, as hath been said, if there were nothing good in such outward adoration which might be pleasing to God; it could not displease him to have it given unto Idols, or false Gods; as every where in Scripture it doth. What a piece of matter had it been for the three Children of God to have fallen down before *Nebuchadnezzar's* Image, in *Daniel*, if there were no account to be made of such outward Acts? not so much surely as of disobedience to the Kings command. Nay, what hurt would there be to fall down to the Devil (as Christ was tempted to do by that Evil and ambitious Spirit) if it did not at all belong to God. Or what good do they, what glory do we understand given by the 24 Elders to God, in the Revelation, when they fall down before the throne of God, if so be there is nothing in it. Surely

Psal. 77. 11.  
Esay 44. 19.

Ez. 45. 14.  
Ez. 46. 6.

Dan. 3. 17

Mat. 4. 9.

Rev. 4. 10.



Surely therefore, it is a part of our duty and service, thus to adore the Divine Majesty, thus to humble our bodies in his presence. And it is seen commonly, in bowing or inclining any part of the body; and sometimes of the whole, by casting it upon the earth as unworthy to stand before God, and to beget the deeper sense of our own vileness, and to move God to pity our prostrated body and dejected mind. Sometimes it may suffice to incline the head, as it were blushing to lift it up with any confidence towards God, and heaven: Sometimes incurvation of the Body, sometimes bending of the knee, and sometimes constant and devout kneeling: according as occasion and opportunity shall be offered, and the spring of inward devotion move the outward parts of the body.

Luk. 18. 33.

For all this while we urge not so necessarily any, much less all these outward acts, so as to require them simply to divine worship, as if a Man could not be accepted without them. Yet so far again we do, that where just authority, competent opportunity, and means, expect any of these from us, wilfully and contemptuously to neglect them, doth make us really believe that God will not hear or accept the pretended real devotion of the inward man, as being corrupted with disobedience and irreverence, and exclusive of part of his Right.

And another rule for directing this manner of worship is this, that we are not singly and of our own head, in publick, to put in use, or act any such ceremonious devotion to the offence of the more general custom, and warranted practise of the Churches, of which we are Members. For all Acts of Reverence are to be estimated, not by private opinions, but by publick and general approbation. For seeing scarce any ceremony is natural, but all by institution and reputation of men judged proper, or indecent: this Decency, the Custom of places and Sentence of Superiours must determine, lest the Church falls into that unhappy state of which *Austin* complains, and be subjected to more burdensome and contrary Rites than the *Jewish* Church suffered; while it is thought lawful under the Gospel, which was not tolerated under the Law, for every single man either to devise a form of worshipping God, out of his own head, or to bring those Rites into that Church in which he lives by his own will, which he had observed to be in use in others, whereof perhaps he hath read, or which in his Travels he hath seen, which the farther they have been and more strange always pass for the most commendable: a thing which *St. Austin* in that Epistle condemns, and that worthily and gravely; and not all Rites introduced ordinarily, and orderly into the Church by good Councils and authority: as many vainly have imagined and drawn his words with wonted ignorance, or spite, against the use of Ceremonies. But what we were saying is this: that all Reverence, and gravity, and decency are wholly such by humane agreement and opinion; and that of the Region wherein they are used. For if any posture, or gesture, or Habit were naturally good or Evil, decent or indecent, it would be so to all countries and people: the contrary to which is most certain, viz, That what one people judgeth grave and decent, another esteemeth ridiculous, and uncomely. To bare the Head in the Western parts of the world, is a token and Act of Reverence, to whom it is done: but absurd and grievous to the Eastern Parts. Again, in the Western Parts, for Men to move their hats, and to bend the Knee to one, is Reverence; but for women to do so, is foolish and ungrateful to any. Black clothes and habit in the *European* Parts and amongst Christians are generally looked on as comely, grave, and decent for

for persons of the soberest rank, but odious to the *Turks*: and so might instances be given in many things of like nature. Which are not for any intrinsick worth in them or natural, received into the service of God, but for that they are partly by consent of men where we live, acknowledged for proper notes of Reverence, or else are by express constitution declared to be such which are designed by the Church to signifie, and express veneration, and esteem of what we do: and upon that become such. For neither do words themselves naturally signifie what we mean by them; nor do letters naturally give such a sound to a word compounded of them, but altogether by human agreement and appointment, no more do these signs and ceremonies of themselves, but by consent and institution, imply reverence and devotion.

Where then do these frivolous and quarrelsome fellows appear, who resolving to undo something done before them; and do somewhat that better suits with their own humours, and unchristian tempers, devise monstrous things in such rites maliciously apply them, zealous enforce the contrary, upon such absurd errors: And will take no denial, when they are pleased to utter such slanders, as these: *That we urge them as of absolute necessity, We prefer them before the more material service of God: We make them conditions of Communion with us.* The first and second of which are directly false, and never can be made good: The Third is indirectly true. For by consequence indeed they become conditions of Communion in all Churches; and their mouths are opened directly and expressly, according to their manner, only against our Church, yet all are no less concerned than ours, yea their own Conventicles are in as much danger of this argument, as our Churches. For I appeal unto themselves whether they would not thrust out from among them such as should dare against their Orders, to do what they list amongst them? Would they suffer one amongst, that should constantly take the Communion kneeling, while the rest sat, or stood? Would they not severely censure and being obstinate eject such an one as should bow at the name of Jesus, against their will, and perhaps him that should own he makes a conscience of being covered in the house of God? Must they not here interpret themselves better in their famous modern Maxime, *Of making outward Rites conditions of Communion*, and so, that their adversaries shall come off as well as they? Or they suffer as much mischief by their own weapon as any else. But what they will say, we regard not, no more than what they have said in that Rule it self, frivolous and fallacious. That which we say to it, is the quite contrary, That we do not make such Orders or customes conditions of our communion, so much as they make them causes of non-communion, and Separation. Let the matter then be brought fairly before alledge Judges, who are to be blamed, they, who have no authority either to appoint, or put down any Ceremonie, and yet, upon that which they can never prove to be forbidden, or unlawful, but as it likes them not (by which they argue us out of all but their own inventions) refuse communion with that Church, to which they have all general obligations to joyn themselves: Or they, who being over them in the Lord (whether they will or not) do form outwardly by such Ceremonies and Rites, the more intrinsick parts of Gods Worship requiring under the sin of disobedience, and pain of Ecclesiastical censures following thereupon, submission unto them. In fine, We accuse them (and believe we are much better able, as we are always ready to prove it) of making innocent (I do not say inoffensive, for where shall we find that thing that offends not some body) rites and

and orders the only ground of Schism; rather than we make them conditions of Communion: And so what they will get by this justification of themselves, they may, and hope will at length, put in their eyes, and cause tears of repentance to fall from them, for their many groundless prevarications, and slanders of both Powers, God had set over them.

## CHAP. III.

*Of the Second thing considerable in Divine Worship; viz. The state wherein we serve God. What is a State. The formal cause of a State Divine, Vows. What is a Vow. The proper matter of Vows, Evangelical Councils: That it is lawful and useful to make Vows under the Gospel, contrary to Peter Martyr. The nature of Vows explained.*

**T**H E Second thing wherein religious worship doth consist in general, is the special state which a true Believer chooseth to serve God in. The state of any thing doth import in it, constancie and subtilty, as *Thomas* hath not amiss described it in general, saying, *In humane actions a matter is said to have a state, according to its particular constitution, with a certain immutability and rest.* Whatever therefore is by nature uncertain and mutable, and becomes determined and fixed, may be said to be in such a state, in which it is so fixed. And though, by the vanity and natural wantonness of Mans will, he is too often unresolved and fickle in his due Obligations towards God; yet by Reason, and much more Religion, every man is bound to God, and his liberty is to serve God; in the common state of Religion; which restrains his irregular motions, and confines him to the will of God. And under this due subjection is every man especially brought, by being baptized, and therein vowing faith and Christian obedience unto God. But as Religion in general is the stating and establishing a man towards God, and as Christian Religion is yet an higher, stricter, and holier obligation and state than Religion in common, so yet, in Christian Religion it self, are there more large and free, and more strait and determined wayes of serving God: which when they are not moveable or mutable in themselves, may be aptly called states of Religion, subordinate to the general Profession. We are therefore first to consider the

*Inde est quod etiam in actionibus humanis dicitur negotium habere aliquem statum; Secundum ordinem propriæ dispositionis cum quadam immobilitate seu quiete. Thomas 2dæ. Qu. 183. c. 1.*



formal cause of this stating a mans self in Religion, and then the principal matters wherein this state doth consist : which may be reduced to these three, *Holy Orders*, *Celibacy or Singleness of Life*, *Monastick Life*, with its appendages of Poverty and Obedience.

That which gives the formality to all these, and makes them a proper state, is the bond of a Vow, under which a man binds himself duly to observe the same. And a Vow is a solemn and sacred promise made to God by a Person free to that thing, of performing somewhat above his ordinary obligation. For by the common covenant and obligation, every Christian hath upon him, as a Christian, and baptized, he hath bound himself to observe all things directly commanded by God ; and which are necessary to salvation. But because these things necessary to salvation, are not so easily determinable by every man, but varying according to the talents of Grace and Nature ; according to outward means, and according to opportunities put into the hands of Man by God, it hath been ever both prudently and piously practised by devout and faithful persons, to secure the necessary duties, by taking upon them some things that are not of themselves, or generally necessary to the pleasing God, and saving themselves. These extraordinary Services are commonly known by *Counsels Evangelical or Perfections*, because they tend to a more perfect and devout walking with God in Mortifications, Self-denials of the pleasures, and unnecessary Comforts of this world, and more pure, immediate, and spiritual communion with God, in the exercise of acts of Religion.

There are many amongst the eminent Reformers who oppose such Evangelical Counsels (it is to be feared) because they would carry away the credit from others of being Religious, and cannot endure to have any thing more eminent in that Religion condemned by them, than is to be found in their Reformation ; and therefore they say, there is no such thing to be allowed or received as Evangelical ; that is, in plain terms, Christian Perfection : but, all states of Christianity are alike. For surely had it not been self-defense and self-love, not to venture flesh and blood farther than is absolutely necessary, but that they might enjoy the world in all its benefits and accommodations not inconsistent with future bliss ; they would never have dar'd to have contradicted the common voice of all Christians, one or two perhaps excepted : who were manifestly reprehended by the general sentence of the age wherein they lived ; and not only Christians, but Jews, and not only Jews, but Heathens too, pretending to Religion. And for my part, as I reverence that as a Law of Nature, in which all men generally conspire and concur : so do I esteem that as a Law of Religion, which all Religious People have, in some manner, used : But all People, as well Christian as Unchristian, have ever allowed, as very laudable, the use of Vows in Chastity, and seclusedness from the common course of the world. And this is of greater force to me than any arguments by the adversaries brought to the contrary.

They want not indeed certain pretty colours to perswade, rather than prove their modern singularities : Some of which, and the principal, are these. First, that we are commanded to love and serve God with all our hearts, with all our souls, with all our strength, and therefore there can be no place for such perfection, seeing it is no more than we are bound to do.

To which I answer, That to love and serve God with all our might, is, in the general, a direct Precept ; and not barely an advice or counsel given to us.

us. But the special duties wherein this universal and absolute service of God consist, are not so determined. For we may love God with all our hearts, according to the intent of the Command, in any one state of life, that is, so far as to prefer God and his service before, and above all; and this may suffice to carry us to Heaven. But this *All* may be taken *Intensively* or *Extensively*: *Extensively* when we subject all things really to our esteem of God, not idolizing any worldly thing, or equalling it to him. But still *Intensively*, a man, so long as he continues in this world, may proceed to higher degrees of the Love of God. And these more perfect degrees are acquired by more constant attendance on Gods worship; and this attendance is caused by sequestering our selves from those many worldly circumstances incident to us in this world: which though not absolutely unlawful (for were it that Marriage or Monastick life were simply and generally necessary, no question but they would have been commanded or forbidden directly) yet upon common consent, more hazardous than the severer part of Christian life may be. And neither wedded life, or a political life are of themselves evil, but expose a man to more temptations, and leave him less at liberty to attend on the Lord without distraction. Yet all this will admit of exceptions, some men undoubtedly (whether Laical or Clerical) living much chaster in wedlock, than others do in Celibacy, and singleness of life: and some men living more divinely and holily in the midst of much business, and tumultuous Cities, than others in Cloysters, or Desarts remote from the worlds contagion and vanity. For might not this be, Precepts would certainly have been delivered in Scripture to bind us to one way. But no judgment or conclusion of a Case is wont to be made by wise men, from the variety and uncertainty of particular persons, but in reference to the thing it self, whether such ways of serving God, which are vulgarly called *Evangelical Counsels*, are not in themselves, with the like concurrence of Gods Grace, and other due circumstances which may be supposed common to other states, more probable and apt means to attain heaven, and serve God more devoutly than the other: and whether this state of separation and dedication of our time and actions unto God, are not more susceptible of the Grace of God than common conversations. The Affirmative we maintain, and see not how the foresaid reason opposes it, to any purpose.

A second main reason is, That, though it is lawful, and may be expedient to choose such a kind of life, yet it is not so fit to bind our selves to it by a Vow. For we must vow to do nothing which is not in our power to perform. But such kind of Chastity, such kind of Separation and Sequestration of our selves from the World and civil Society, is not in our power to fulfil. And that because they are the special Gifts of God; as the Scripture telleth us, when it saith, *Every man hath his proper gift of God*, 1 Cor. 7.7. &c. and these are such.

But to this I demand, first, What they mean by a thing being in our power? Do they mean in our natural power, without Gods blessing and grace, above our natural ability? then indeed this, and many more Christian duties are beyond our power and strength to do of our selves. Our whole Vow of Baptism consists of such particulars as the Catechise tells us truly, *We are not able to do of our selves*. Shall the Vow therefore in Baptism be judged rash, unreasonable, and unlawful, because we have vowed more than we can make good of our selves? Oh, but (say they) this Vow is necessary and commanded by God, but the other are unnecessary and uncom-

Phil. 4. 13.  
1 Cor. 12. 31.

1 Cor. 7. 7.

1 Cor. 7. 37.

manded. But this is but little to the purpose, supposing all were true that is in the exception supposed: For we are now enquiring abstractly, and in general, after the nature of a vow; whether a Vow may not be made of those things that are not naturally in our power. For the necessity, or the command of God himself, cannot make that reasonable for us to do, or vow to do, which we are wholly unable to do. And by consequence, this sort of vowing would be much worse than the other, as bringing Gods Providence and Justice into question, as well as mans Wisdom and Piety; that he should command us to do that which we are not able to do, and to vow what we are not able to perform. But if they take Gods Grace, his Promise, and Goodness in to the assistance of mans natural or reasonable abilities, as they ought to do, how can they say directly, that the matter of such Vows are not in our power? St. Paul could do all things through him that strengthened him. And so surely may other good Christians do, so far as he requires. And we know the Scripture requires, *Covet earnestly the best gifts.* The question then will return again upon us with no less force than before; whether these states be not more perfect, and better than others. For if so, they may be coveted and aspired after; though they be not absolutely in our Power. I confess, according to the Doctrine of St. Paul, all men have not the same gifts, either of Nature or Grace. *Every man hath his proper gift of God, &c.* And withal, that such may be the natural tempers and inclination of some persons towards Conjugal and Political Society, that they may wholly distrust themselves in the due execution of such Vows. And therefore such Vows may be unlawful in those circumstances and junctures. But when a man considers, first, the Grace and Promise of God; when he considers again, the vertue of ordinary means to attain these graces, in withdrawing a mans self from the outward Incentives to transgress, and denying himself the common occasions disposing to such things, against which he vows; and lastly, the efficacy of a Vow duly made; which upon reflexion may quench all sparks falling into the heart or mind of man; he can scarce affirm positively, that such a thing is not in his power, but because it is not in his will. And doth not St. Paul plainly suppose as a certain truth, that a man may have power over his own will, even in such things as these, where he saith, *Nevertheless, be that standeth stedfast in his heart, having no necessity, but hath power over his own will, and hath decreed in his heart that he will keep his virgin, doth well?* And doth it not in like manner from hence follow, that this power that a man hath over his own will, may be lawdably exerted and exercised in decreeing stedfastly such a state of Life, as we now speak of, and that this is well done?

This evidence of truth against the frivolous exceptions of some, hath occasioned another more favourable, and moderate, and most reasonable of all the Objections I can call to mind on this subject. They dare not determine against the matter of such Evangelical perfections: and waving their opposition to Vows of this nature, they persist to deny, that, if such perfect state there be, it is free to accept or refuse it; if we have such a measure of Divine Grace, whereby we are enabled to walk so perfectly: And that in such cases, there is the obligation of a Precept upon us to live so, rather than the nature of a Counsel: (and it is the distinction of Counsel and Command which is so much stomached by them;) The reason hereof is, because God in justice doth exact answerable service to his Talents lent unto his servants. And so having given them grace and power to do an acceptable



acceptable piece of worship to him, doth rather command, than advise that it should be performed.

To the solution of this may be useful that distinction of *Gerson*, rarely to be found in others. For he finds another thing between *Precept* and *Counsel*, and that is, *Monition* or *Admonition*, which, says he, binds more than Counsels, and less than Precepts. And so I conceive it true, that in the Case above put of Gods grace more enabling a man, a disposing him to greater perfections, then are common to Christians, that there doth thereupon follow a tacite admonition, and particular injunction to improve the same to the best effects and ends: but this cannot properly be called a Precept, or a Command, according to the received manner of speech, which to alter for no other reason but to gratifie squeamish minds and stomachs, is no reason. For a Precept according to *Gerson* in another Treatise, is *A Command obliging to observation of a thing, or act commanded*: which description I suppose he borrowed from St. *Austin*, who saith, *A Precept is such a thing that it is sin not to obey it. A Counsel is that, which if you refuse to make use of, you obtain less good, but commit no evil*. So that as *Ambrose* and *Prosper*, and innumerable other Fathers, as well Greek as Latin, speak in this case, A Precept is that which keeps the Law. Counsel that which transcends the Law. Now to apply this more particularly, Commands and Counsels are general, and extend to all, but with this difference: that a Precept or Command is general and absolute, binding all without exception under the penalties of sin and punishment: Counsels bind all, but not absolutely, but conditionally upon such considerations of aiming at more then ordinary perfection of virtue and reward. Admonition can be nothing else but a personal advice and exhortation, upon certain supposals made of having (for instance greater measure of Grace from God:) But such as this last cannot prejudice the two former, because we are not now speaking of Particulars, which are infinite, according to emergent occasions, and so can be no rule to direct men by: but of those things which may be reduced to general Rules, nothing personal is considered in them. And thus the former Opinion holds good, which distinguisheth two Classes of Christians, from the two several methods and ways before them: And that though *Martha* may certainly attain heaven: Yet *Mary* may set above her there, and that by reason that she had on earth chosen the better part. For the better concluding this point, I shall transcribe *Gersons* modest and moderate sense of it, as that which I hold very fair and reasonable; in a Treatise on purpose of these things. *Though it be acknowledged that Counsels conduce to the perfection of Christian life, yet they are not essentially requisite to Christian perfection. The first of these is clear from the discourse of the Gospel: For the second, it is thus argued, Because many have been perfect in a spiritual life without the observation of Evangelical Counsels, as appears from Abraham — and from Job. From whence it is manifest, that Evangelical Counsels so far pertain to perfection of Spiritual Life and conduce to it; because they are as so many Instruments exceedingly expediting and furthering perfection of Spiritual Life to be obtain'd; and preserves it being once had: Thus he: and no more, nor less do I mean or intend to say at present, concerning the use of them: which being rightly understood and fairly considered, is sufficient to plead for it self. But could this be only said for it, that no man hath dar'd directly to condemn it, it might suffice an equal mind. For though there were more than a good many that deny the Institution of them in Scriptures, they can-*

*Monitio dicitur quod plus ligat quam Concilium, & minus quam preceptum. Gerson de Vita Spiritualis, Lib. 5.*

*Preceptum est imperium obligans ad observationem rei vel actus imperati.*

*Gerson de Decem preceptis, To. 1. Par. 2.*

*Preceptum est hoc cui non obedire peccatum est. Concilium quo si unus noluisset minus boni adipiscaris, nomen mali aliquid pertrahis. Aug. de Sta. Virginit. cap. 15. & 17.*

*Si Concilia ad vitam Christianam perfectionem facere dinoscuntur, non tamen essentialiter hominem perficiunt, &c. Gerson de Consiliis Evangelicis.*

not

Humphredus  
contra 2 Ra-  
tion, Cam-  
piani.

not deny the things so commended to be lawful, and consonant to Christian Religion and the Scriptures: nor that those methods duly observed, make not towards the high ends of Christianity: only sundry Cases they are able to put, and I make no doubt, but might give many Instances of the not only vain, but evil success of such means. But so may they of many more things which they hold requisite to edification, and increase of Grace. Was not *Judas* much worse after the Eucharist received (for that he did receive it, contrary to some mens opinion, I here suppose) than he was before? And we can instance in many who by zealous preaching and prayer have exposed themselves and others to greater damnation, than if they had never taken on them that holy function, or these had not so devoutly throng'd them. Dr. *Humphrey* therefore against *Campion* speaketh as much, as I think the Church of *Rome* it self demands in this, though he shewes an avernesse to agreement therein, as suspecting what is no wayes to be feared, as being a contradiction to the state of the Question it self; which supposeth that those perfections are rather voluntary than necessary; free, and not constrained; and the very terms of the question declare they are Counsels, and not Commands, and yet he pleases to write thus. *They call them Evangelical Counsels, which are not commanded in the Gospel. And what Christ speaks of Eunuchs (for the Kingdom of Heavens sake) in the Gospel, and what Saint Paul speaks of Virginity, we oppose not greatly. Let it be a Counsel to whom it is given* [but we have already shewed that Counsels no less than Precepts are given to all, though all do not, and none are bound to take them simply] *so they consent that it is not commanded; Let it be free, so it be not constrain'd. Let it be voluntary, so it be not necessary; not by a vowing Law, not obtruded upon men.* It were a manifest contradiction to hold that such Counsels should be so necessary or forced. None does, none can hold them so. There are not wanting indeed too many Instances of these states imposed upon persons, without any consent of theirs: and this is a notorious and unsufferable abuse of them, not in a sober mode defended by the practisers of it. In such Cases, until at least there shall be a free consent *postmate* to that state, it can neither be called *Counsel* nor *Perfection*: but on the one hand extream and barbarous tyranny and villany; and on the other unprofitable misery and compulsion.

But that which troubles many is the Vow annext to, and confirming such like righteous resolutions. For a Vow, say they, makes it necessary and destroys liberty. Indeed, if this liberty were taken away by any man, besides ones self, no small invasion of both natural and Christian liberty, to the reproach of such bonds: But when a man freely binds himself, he is more afraid than hurt in his precious jewel, Liberty. And is there not a Vow in marriage, as well as in single life? Should therefore a man refuse to marry because he thereby doth apparently take away his liberty? as St. *Paul* expressly teaches, where he tells us *A man* [that is married] *hath not power over his own body, nor a woman power of her body.* Indeed this he may do out of prudence humane, if he pleases. But if he pleases to marry, and not pleases to vow Chastity and Constancy in marriage, he would be a profaner of that sacred Order. If they say, that this is necessary, but the other is not necessary: and therefore this may be lawful and useful, but not the other; I answer, first, this begs the thing in question, which is, that we are not to vow but in things in themselves good or evil, which contradicts all examples of commendable vows in Scripture. Secondly, That it is equally necessary a man should live in Chastity, whether in single or wedded life; and it is certain, there is no invincible necessity of seeking remedy against the temptations of a single Life,

1 Cor. 7. 4.

life, by marriage. And it is certain likewise, that marriage doth not infallibly prevent the mischiefs of incontinence of an higher nature. And seldom is it found but the same person, if he used the like care and conscience over himself before his marriage, that he doth, and hath bound himself to do, after his marriage, but he might live continently out of marriage, as well as in marriage. For very many accidents do occur, and some constantly, in wedlock, which renders that remedy useles to men. Now, if it be argued that a man ought not to vow *Virginal* or *Vidual* Chastity, because many times (which is true) the Devil takes an occasion from thence to tempt him worse; the same will be said against the Vow of Fidelity to God and Man, in the state of Matrimony. For the fall is much worse, and the danger not much less, as hath been shewed. And the Devil most busily and eagerly seeks to impel to those sins which are most notorious. How many have with little wit and great impudence, professed they could love their own Wives above all women, were it not for the reason that God and Nature requires they should prefer them so, that they are their wives, and that they are tyed to them, their liberty is destroyed thereby? And may not as good an argument be made from hence against all Votal Ties in marriage, as from marriage? And whereas it is said, a Vow casts a man divers times into a greater temptation: it is meerly accidental and personal, according to the particular humour of some men, who knowing their disease of contradiction and renitencie to what is imposed on them, may with prudence avoid such a snare, as they call it. But we all know, things are not to be estimated or concluded from such contingencies and personal irregularities, but from the nature of the things themselves. And none can deny but the nature of a Vow is to bind, and not to loose; and to prevent, and not to lead into temptations or snares: and withal, he that Vows the thing, or the effect, doth implicitly vow the means conducing thereunto, and against the occasions and temptations tending to the contrary.

It is farther objected against a Vow, that it is taken to be part of the worship of God: And this, *Being made part of the worship of God*, is a general Battering Ram, whereby most ill Reforming Divines endeavour to beat down all things they like not. For first, they religiously hold that nothing must be part of Gods worship which he hath not commanded in his word: which is not altogether true, nor false, no more then the contrary; That every thing commanded in his Word is part of his worship. And again, they hold that every thing that is done in the worship of God, is part of the worship of God; and from hence set themselves with great animosity against all forms, and actions, and Ceremonies in order to the service of God, as so many parts of the worship of God, of humane invention, and therefore to be utterly rejected: And such, say they, are Vows.

The Popish writers do grant, and go about to prove that they are Acts of Gods worship, but very unluckily to themselves, holding that they are Counsels and not Precepts; The Puritan Writers, that they are so far from that, that they are unlawful, but in those things that are commanded of God; and therefore, in the Instances before given of single and separate life, unlawful. But *Peter Martyr* (it should seem) goes by himself, denying the use of all Vows under the New Testament, but approving of them under the Old, as commanded many times, and being uncommanded worship under the New Testament: And that with men of such principles, is bad enough.

*Bellarmino. de  
Monachib. lib. 2.  
cap. 16. To. 2.*

But



But I suppose a mean way is best in this case ; which holdeth Vows lawful, even in uncommanded worship : and Secondly , that of themselves they are no part, nor so much as <sup>an</sup>act of Gods service, but the manner only of his service. And Thirdly, that it is no less lawful and expedient to Vow under the state of the Gospel than under the Law.

And to begin with the last ; That which deceived *Peter Martyr* and divers others, seems to be an erroneous supposition made by them, that Vows were under precept and command under the Law, in certain cases ; but it is not so. For though many Rules and Precepts are found in *Moses* his Law about governing and regulating them that had freely made Vows, there is no precept given that men should vow, but that was left free. Secondly, those Precepts of paying Vows found in Scriptures, do not at-all concern the taking of Vows simply. So *David* : *Vow and pay unto the Lord*, meaneth no more than *Vowing, pay unto the Lord* : which is the meaning of the Prophet *Esaiah* also, saying : *The Egyptians shall vow a vow unto the Lord, and perform it.* And in no place of Scripture is there any injunction simply to vow. And therefore the case being alike as to the Vow it self, though different as to the matter, if it were lawful for the Jews to do this uncommanded act, as they call it, it is also lawful for Christians, whom they acknowledge to be no more, but rather less bound up from uncommanded worship than the Jews.

And from hence are easily and better answered *Peter Martyrs* arguments against Vows of Christians, then by *Bellarmino*. For we deny that Vows were instituted Ceremonies under the Law, which *Martyr* supposeth ; for they were not instituted at all. And that he saith, *That we have no mention of Vows in the New Testament as there is in the Old*, is not altogether true, as shall be seen afterward : but if it were true ; as hath been said, those things which we know by the light and law of nature, the Scriptures are not so solicitous simply to institute, as to prescribe Rules concerning the due execution of them. But common reason hath instructed Gentile, Jew, and Christian, upon occasion, to vow to God ; and therefore, whatever is peculiar to Christians is provided for by the New Testament, in determining the matter consistent with Christian Faith and common equity, and the manner, First, that it be made by a Person who hath power over himself : For no man can make a lawful Vow to do any thing to the prejudice of the right of another. And therefore children under the power of their Parents, cannot bind themselves firmly in any such Vow which tendeth to the disobliging them from their known duty to their Parents : neither can Subjects vow any thing to the disservice of their Sovereign or Country : Nor can Clergy-men vow any thing contrary to the subjection and obedience of their Superiours, or detriment of the Church in general, unless it be ratified by them : but all is void, or may be made void by them in lawful power over them. And the Arguments of *Peter Martyr* taken from Christian Liberty have been answered already.

Now to return to the first, That Vows are lawful to Christians is shewed already from the natural reason of Vows. And that it was not an invention of *Moses*, or introduced by God, first under him, appears from the general consent of all religious persons who never knew any thing of the Law of *Moses*, or if, as in later times, some nations did, yet regarded it not : And from the practise of *Jacob* long before *Moses*, who we read *vowed unto the Lord a vow*. It appears likewise from the many moral precepts in the *Psalms*, *Proverbs*, *Ecclesiastes*, which concern themselves very little in the

the Law of *Moses*. And the Predictions in the Prophets of Vows to be made at the time of the Gospel, are not well put off by saying the Prophets spake figuratively. But it may be here noted, as a wonderful dangerous abuse of the Old Testaments Authority, not to be content to admit an invalidity of proofs drawn from thence to confirm Evangelical Duties; but to make it no small presumption against the Evangelicalness of any duty, that it is first found in the Old Testament; which is a gross abuse of Scripture; especially by them who would be held enemies to *Antimonians*. They ought therefore, first of all, to show that such things are purely Legal, that is, as the Law it self is Mosaical, and Typical, and Ceremonial, before they can damn them there, for no better reason but, there they find them.

Add to this, when we challenge them to the most ancient and manifold Precedents of the Christian Church, who constantly made Vows of various natures to God, they presently betake themselves to their common subterfuge, pretence of appeal to the Word of God as a Rule, and that without any respect to any not truly divine, Guides otherwise directing: And this they do, as confidently, as if it had been concluded out of Scripture, to the contrary. For in such cases indeed their appeal would be most just and reasonable: but until that, little better then ridiculous; especially Scripture being before advised about, and appearing not definitive in the case; Antiquity and Holy precedents consulted with, the better to know the mind of Scripture. For instance, that text of St. Paul to *Timothy*, faith of young Widows, *They have damnation in themselves because they have cast off their first Faith.* Many of late dayes interpret the Apostle to mean only the Faith of Christ, in general: Others understand him to speak of a Faith particularly made to Christ, by the Order of Widows vowing singleness of life; and in all reason this seems to be most favoured by the context. But besides this, appeal is made by the one party to the judgment of the ancient and holy Christians interpreting this both by their writings and practise, as relating specially to the dedication of Widowhood to God. After this fair dealing, for men to declare they will be tryed by none but that which they know is the main thing in question, is very vain, and somewhat more. They having no special text so interdicting such Vows, as this is to commend them. But the worst of it is this, that if there were any way more perfect then that they have pitched on, they should be sufferers in the good opinion of the world, but that must by no means be endured. And this, at the end of all, is the great absurdity they bring us to: but surely not so great, but both the Cause and Defenders of it may well show their face after all this granted and owned.

1 Tim. 5. 12

The second thing, now in the third place to be touched, is concerning the Nature of a Vow in it self, viz. That so it is no proper act, nor any proper part of Gods Service, but the manner of it. For to vow to God is an indifferent thing to Good or Evil. A man may as well vow to Gods dishonour, as his glory: It is therefore good or evil in relation to the matter, about which the Vow is made. For to vow Sacrifices under the Law, and to vow Alms under the Gospel, or Virginity, or such like, is no farther part of the Service of God then the thing it self tends to the worship of God: and its nature and office is to bind to the true and due performance of a thing, but not absolutely a duty in its self.

The principle doubt on the contrary may be that which is taken from that which a man devotes to God, as an ingredient to all vows. For when a

man vows, he of a free man makes himself servile, and limited to one of those things, to which formerly he was free. And this we have shewed is an argument of some against vowing; because it takes away the liberty God had given. On the other side, the contrary party may in my judgment, turn it against them, and make it an argument of worth and excellencie, because it gives to God that which is to us most precious. For when St. Paul saith, *If you may be free, use it rather, and stand fast in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made you free*; he undoubtedly means only in reference to man; and then only, when we really have, and not presume only that we have, such a liberty: and when this liberty is that which pertaineth to the substance of the Gospel, as most of those places alledged to found a liberty, do aim at. But do they think (as it should seem) that either Natural, Civil, or Evangelical Liberty is such a thing, and so given unto us of God, that we may not render it to him, nor part with it again to him? Is it too good or sacred to give him it, from whom we received it? Nay, the more dear and precious it is to us, the more acceptable it should be to him. When we deny ourselves the liberty he hath given us, the better to serve him: surely it is no less pleasing to God than to part with meat, drink, money, and the time which he hath given us, dedicating the same to him. It is strange therefore, next to monstrous, that Christians should stumble so at the Scriptures (and they especially, who will scarce allow any man to be cunning in the Scriptures besides themselves, or to be governed by them as they pretend to be) as to make such fond conclusions from them, the contrary to which is much the truer. To give away our liberty to God, is an excellent Sacrifice to him; and they would prove out of Scripture, we ought not to give it him at all. For if they prove not this, they prove nothing; when they say, *we ought not to make vows to him, because it takes away our liberty*. And therefore, to the argument, *viz.* that by this it should follow that vowing is in it self an act, or part of Gods worship; I answer, That if any thing here be an act of worshipping God, it is the giving up it self of our liberty, and not the vowing to give it up: for this is but the means and manner so to serve and worship God, and not the worship it self. And thus much Perkins acknowledges in vows about bodily exercises, such as Fasting, Prayers, and Alms; but likes not it so to be in other matters. Indeed, as he confusedly and crudely touches the point, passing from the nature of a Vow in it self, which was his question unto the matter, he might very well write against some vows, and prove them unlawful, when the thing it self is unlawful to be done, whether with, or without a vow, such as are ceremonial acts of the Law of Moses, and moral evils against truth, justice, or piety it self. And thus much of the form of vowing, the lawfulness and uses in general.

Perkins Cases  
of Conscience, Chap.  
14. Lib. 2.



## CHAP. IV.

*Of the Matter of Vows in particular. And first, of the Virginal state, that it is both possible and laudable. And that it is lawful to vow Celibacie or Widowhood. No Presidents in the Old Testament favouring Virginity. The Virgin Mary vowed not Virginity, no Votary before the Annunciation.*

**V**W E now come to speak more particularly of Vows, as to their matter. And because the matter of Vows may be infinite, as good and evil, to which they extend themselves; to Good affirmatively, and Evil negatively; I shall confine my Discourse at present to the three most noted things in Vows, in which, we have said, the states of serving God principally consisteth: A Clerical state, a state Virginal or Vidual, and a state Monastical: all which ordinarily do, or may relate to the worship of God in a more eminent manner; yet not with such inseparable vertues to that end, that it may not, and doth not often happen that they expose to greater mischiefs. But it must alwayes be remembered, that we, nor any man else, do not compare the vices of a single life with the vertues of a married life; nor compare the vices of a separate and claustral life, with the sobriety of a political life. For who is so fond and blind a Patron of them, as to commend them, before these? And yet we find most of the Adversaries of the said states to argue from this most unequal supposition, that the one lives contrary to his Rule and Order; and the other agreeably to his: and then having thus disadvantageously stated the Case, triumph in a vain and silly victory, they presume to have obtained. But put the Case, as in all justice and reason it ought to be, between a person that keeps to the rules and ends of separate and single life; and him that keeps to the rules and ends of a conjugal life, or political, and then let the matter be fairly debated and determined; which is to be preferred before other.

Now that such a supposition may be made, and that a separate state from women, and on the other side of women from men, may be laudably made good (which too many are so hard of belief as to judge next to impossible) will appear from these three heads: From the Scripture: From Examples: And from the favourable sense to be made of such estates.

First, our Saviour supposes it done, and implicitly recommends the doing of it to others, which he would never have done, had there been no moral possibility of observing the same: For saying in St. *Matthew*, *There be* Matth. 19. 12.

1 Cor. 7. 7.

1 Tim. 5.

*Eunuchs for the Kingdom of Heavens sake. He that is able to receive it, let him receive it:* Is there any Expositour of account in the Church, who can deny that Christ spake here of marriage? Can they deny that Christ gives his approbation of that *Eunuchism* voluntary, or denial to a mans self, the ordinary use of women? Can they deny that he advises to it upon supposition that a man is able? How then can they deny the moral possibility of Virginal Chastity? And doth not St. Paul, wishing that *All men were as he was*, wish that they lived in single estate at least, if not Virginity? And doth he not in the forecited place to *Timothy*, condemn those persons who have violated their troth given to Christ, to live sequester'd from men? I know late Interpreters have drawn the Apostles words to another sense, but contrary to the received; and therefore easily not received by any man. These and many other places of Scripture, especially in the Seventh Chapter of the First Epistle to the *Corinthians*, which do prefer and exhort to single life, do much more advise us of the possibility of duly persevering in that state, and at the same time, of the Eligibleness of that state above the contrary.

Secondly, The examples of the pure and holy life of unwedded persons, are innumerable, and so glorious, as it puts me to the blush for them, who cannot blush, to oppose such a cloud of witnesses of Fathers, and Councils, and Canons Special concerning the tuition and value of such Livers, rather than Injunctions to that state, and eminent lights of Examples as all Ecclesiastical Histories abound with. They are confessedly many, great, and certain, and therefore I shall spare the labour of instancing in any of them: as likewise of the many and rich ornaments of Rhetorick wherewith the ancient Fathers have decked and commended that state; even to that degree, that they may be thought sometimes to have overdone in the point: And do often put in seasonable and serious Cautions that the eminence of that condition should not give them the temptation of high-mindedness and pride. As *Augustine* saying, *Virginitas is not only to be magnified that it might be loved, but admonished that it be not puffed up.* And afterward: *For even that it self is not honorable so much, because it is Virginity, but because it is dedicated to God.* So that in another place he saith: *I speak not rashly, a Woman that is married, is better then a Virgin to be married: for she hath what the other desireth.* It is not therefore simply good, but only as it renders a person more apt to serve God, with better attention, less distraction, as St. Paul intimateth, and more devotion: and is a great victory over the natural will, and a self denial of the lawful use of the world, as *Origen* upon *Genesis* noteth. For, saith he, *the Church of Christ being fortified by the Grace of him that was crucified for her, not only abstaineth from unlawful and abominable beds, but also from lawful, &c.* St. *Chrysostome* commends the state of Religion under the Gospel from this, that under the Law Virginity is not so much as mentioned, any farther then by way of Prophecie, as to be in the New Law of Christ: and that particularly in *Psalms* 45. v. 14, 15. And in another Homily he gives us the reason, why Virginity was not commanded in the New Testament; viz. because of its Excellencie, which all good Christians could not attain to,

And perhaps (which is a third thing to be noted in devoting single life to God) the severities and fears are too much aggravated by some) and the difficulties of preserving the soul and mind chaste and pure, wherein true Virginity consisteth, rather than in corporal Integrity, as the Fathers, and particularly St. *Austin*, grants, and proves at large. For when

Aug de Sanct.  
Virginitat. c.  
1. & cap. 8.  
cap. 11.  
1 Cor. 7. 35.  
Ecclesia Christi  
gratia ejus  
qui pro se cruci-  
fixus est ro-  
borata, &c.  
Origen. Hom.  
3. in Genes.  
Τὸ δὲ παρθε-  
νίας σιμὸν  
ἐστὶν ὅτι τῆς  
παραλαβῆς  
μαχρὶς ἐνέ-  
μαλ' ὅτι, ἐπὶ  
ἡμῶν, &c.  
Chrys. Hom.  
61. Tom. 6.  
Καὶ τὸ π,  
παρθενίας ἡ-  
συχία ἐστὶν ἐν  
τῇ καὶ τῇ ὁ-  
νείῳν ἡλθε  
τῆς ἀνάγκης  
διὰ τὸ ὑπε-  
ρίον; Chrys.  
Hom. 77. in  
Matthæum.

when Chastity is vowed, certainly all evil motions and inward lustings, are declared against, as well as outward impurities; but alwayes with a supposal of humane frailties, and allowances for suddain, unadvised, and unapproved evil cogitations. Nay perhaps, though a person fails so far as to entertain with assent and consent morose thoughts (as they call lasting and delighting cogitations of sin) he may not be said to break the form of his Vow, though he in some measure violates the end of his Vow. And as to sin, which is contained in the Vow of Virginity, mens hands and minds were tyed from that, before they vowed, as really, though not so strongly as afterward. The precise object therefore of such Vows is properly an unwedded life, together with Chastity. Which, that it is not so unsuperable a difficulty as to exceed the ordinary power of man, by the Grace of God enabling him, appears from the ordinary course of life of the opposers of that state. For do not they themselves pass through the difficult and fiery tryals of such temptations frequently in the prime of their dayes, the strength of corrupt nature, and weakness of reason, faith, and prudence to bridle irregular inclinations, and yet would take it very ill men should condemn them for violaters of Gods Laws, and impure offenders in that kind? Can civil prudence or policie secure them in the most dangerous time of all, till they are freed from that place which makes them incapable of being married; or they are put into a fair and hopeful condition to live handsomly in the world, according to their judgment and design; and may not the higher and nobler ends of Religion propounded to a mans self, and studiously improved, have the same effect, and give them the same or greater safety? Do they, many of them, live chastly for thirty years, it may be more or less, unmarried, and yet would be loath to be censured for unchast persons, and that upon the grounds of humane and carnal prudence, and dare they to decree them to naughtiness out of necessity, who shall choose that life perpetually out of the grounds of Religion? This hangs very ill together: They will say out of *St. Paul*, *It is better to marry than to burn*. Very good. But when? and how? and on whom doth this Rule take place? so soon as he begins to burn? Or though he burns, not till he be rich enough, and is outwardly accommodated to his likeing? Can a man preserve himself for the worlds sake, when he may less expect the assistance of Gods Grace, and can he not for Gods sake, when he may more hope for it? But *Theodoret* doth in great part relieve both one, and other: where he interprets *St. Paul*, not so rigorously, that all infestation of lustful motions should oblige any person to marriage, but only such an evil which should wholly master a man. Yet is not any person, from the remission of the severest Law of Chastity by the favour of God, to indulge to himself a latitude in the custody he ought to have over his person: for then it becomes not a venial or light Infirmity, but a presumptuous breach of his Vow and Gods Law.

But yet there remains the old known exception against what is said, which not absolutely denying the possibility of such a life, denies that any such state of life is to be chosen under the bonds of a Vow. To which we may yield thus much, that at the first publishing of the Gospel, and practise of single life, such Vows of Virginity or chaste Widowhood were in less use than afterward. That there was not any such life in ordinary use, nay so much as mentioned in the Church of the Jews, we have heard *Chrysostome* positively oppose, and thereby refel the bold argument of *Bellarmino*,

proving

Aug. de Civ.  
Dei, lib. 1.  
cap. 17, & 18.

Πύρωσιν ὅ  
δὲ τὴν ἐν-  
χλυσιν τῆς  
ἐπιθυμίας,  
ἀλλὰ τὴν ἡρ-  
πὴν ἀνέμωσιν.  
Theod. Hæ-  
retic, Fabula-  
rum, l. 5. c. 26.

Vide etiam  
Chrysostom.  
Περὶ παρθε-  
νίας. To. 6.  
pag. 251.  
Bellarm. de  
Monachis,  
l. 2. c. 22.



See Selden de  
Jure Gentium,  
Et apud He-  
breos, lib. 5.  
cap. 3.

proving the Virgin *Mary* had made a vow of perpetual Virginity, before the Salutation of the Angel towards her; which, as he and *Baronius*, with many of the same mettal, was the cause she wondered so at. the manner of speech to her. But there were other causes sufficient to cause wonder in the Blessed Virgin, besides a Vow of Virginity: though some Fathers prone to imagine the highest, it may be, of the Holy Virgin, have in the height of their Rhetorick let fall somewhat to that purpose. Yet it is manifest from the Records of the Jewish Church, there was nothing of that nature in use amongst them; and if not, It is not to be believed that the Virgin *Mary* took up such a strange and illaudable resolution, as that was amongst them, who esteemed want of off-spring no small disparagement to them. I wonder here most at *Perkins*, how his fervour and judgment should so far fail him herein, as to give such an unnecessary advantage to his Enemies, to affirm that *Jephtha's* daughter was the first that vowed Virginity. When it is most certain that if that sense be granted, that she was not sacrificed properly, but only devoted to God; this was no free act, chosen by her self, but a sad sentence of her Father, condemning her to that unhappy state of life.

But that it is lawful, not only to do this, but also Vow the performance thereof, needs no other arguments than may be easily drawn from the general grounds of the lawfulness and usefulness of Vows, in the former Chapter. And the constant practise of the most Saints of God, in the Church of God; whom, upon such account as this, for men to pelt with vain censures, is the very next way to ruin their own esteem and reputation; which they may aim to raise by such unfortunate attempts, unless perhaps with such, who can judge of nothing but from their mouths. For what a man may do lawfully without a Vow, he may do much more with a Vow; but such things as these may be done without a Vow, therefore also with one,

## CHAP.

## CHAP. V.

*Of the second state of special serving God, the Clerical state or Ministerial. Of the necessity and liberty of singleness of life in a Clergyman. The Opinion and custom of Antiquity concerning it. That it is in the power of the Church at this day to restrain or permit the marriage of Priests. The Conveniencies and Inconveniencies of wedded life in Priests. Chrysostom's Judgment of Marriage and Virginitie recited.*

**I**N the next place, we are to look into the state of serving God in Ecclesiastical Ministration: and here first apply what is above spoken concerning Celibacie to the Clergy. There are not wanting amongst the Romanists who annex Celibacie to a Clerical Life, by a Divine Precept; but with so little probability of truth, and modesty of writing that, the learnedest of their own Party are ashamed of them, and confute them: and so we leave them.

The most current opinion is, That by perpetual Tradition and Precept of the Church, marriage of the Clergy hath been restrained. But this will by no means hold; First against the very first institution of Ecclesiastical Persons by Christ himself; who, as it were to sanctifie marriage in general, concerned himself in the marriage of others: And to declare how that state was not at all inconsistent with a state Clerical of twelve Disciples which Christ chose to minister for him, Eleven are supposed to be married persons; or at least to have been married formerly. To answer which by saying, that after they were chosen they forsook their wives, is to evade and not really to answer. First, because it had been as easie for Christ surely, to have picked out a dozen persons free from the knowledge of women, as to make choice of such as were wedded, had he judged any incapacity in these to the Evangelical Ministry. But secondly, do we find any thing in special prescribed by Christ for such separation from wives, more than for other Christians, who were not Ministers of the Gospel. For of all faithful Christians it is spoken, in certain junctures, that whoever forsaketh not Father, and Mother, and Brethren, and Sisters, and Wife, and Children for Christs sake, cannot be his Disciple. And there is no rule but common necessity and prudence (not Divine prescription) which requires any man for the Gospels sake to forsake his Wife, rather than his Father and Mother. Yet that the Apostles did actually absent, rather than separate themselves from their Wives, and that others who enter'd  
into

John 2.1,2.

1 Cor. 7.26.

1 Cor. 7.25.

Bellarm. de  
Clericis, l. 1.  
c. 19.

1 Chron. 24.

into the ministration to the Church under the Apostles, foreseeing what St. Paul expresseth, *the present distress* of the Church, as well in regard of the persecutions of the Church, as the paucity of Preachers, the greatness of the Harvest, and the small number of Labourers, did decline the state of marriage, is very probable: because they were required by Christs Injunction to *Go and teach all Nations*: which travelling life ill could consist with cohabitation with Wives. And therefore, it must be given them *Gratis*, and not by the merits of any reason or grounds they can show, that that such relinquishing of their Wives was either total, or upon conscience made of the thing it self. Doth not St. Paul say expressly in the words before those now touched, *Concerning Virgins, I have no commandment of the Lord*? If such as served at the Altar were to be excepted, surely he would not have left the Rule so general as we find; speaking only according to humane prudence. And though they search with their best eyes, they shall not be able to find in any other writings of the Apostles, one Text of Scripture obliging Bishops or Priests to singleness of life, more than those of the Laity: unless they argue from reason, That Virginal Chastity is more severe, more pure, more spiritual than conjugal, which is yielded, and therefore more obliging the Clergy, who should be more spiritual persons than others: all which I deny not; but say, that this binds them no more from marriage than it doth from wine and strong drink, which if none of the Clergy ever used, they were the more to be commended, unless in such cases as St. Paul advises *Timothy, For their stomachs sake, and often infirmities*. And thus is *Bellarmin's* first proof laid.

The sole grounds then of unmarried state of Priests must be fetch'd from Tradition and Reason: of both which we shall presume to speak a word or two. Apostolical Tradition is pretended, but not trusting much to that, recourse is had to the Old Testament, from certain allegorical interpretations made of some Rites in *Moses's* Law, which may do well in the Church, where they used them to perswade, but ill in the Schools, to prove the same as a necessary duty. The argument taken from the custom of the Priest abstaining from their Wives during the time of their ministration, I do really believe to have had an influence upon Primitive Christians Judaizing in many other things of like nature, to restrain them from the use of their Wives upon solemn ministrations. But this was without Law or Canon, freely undertaken, and embraced as was Celibacy it self, at first, until about the year 385. *Siricius* Bishop of *Rome* made a constitution that it should, and ought to be; and that on that ground. And that the inferiour Orders, such as Ostiaries, Readers, Exorcists, and Acolythites should only be permitted to marry. But *Alexander* the third about the year 1160 proceeded, according to the method of that Church, to shut them also out the doors of Orders, that should presume to marry. But all, that was done against those in greater or sacred Orders in the Church for more than three hundred years after Christ, was to deny such as were married access to the Altar by way of ministration, who from that time abstained not from their Wives, as did the Council of *Arles*, and some in *Spain*. Only a custom prevailed very generally and anciently, to suffer none who were in those called *Sacred Orders*, such as were Bishops, and Priests, and Deacons, to marry after they were so ordained; for if they did, they were dismissed of their Office or their Wives. The Eastern Church ever accepted of married persons into the Clergy, and at length, understanding the Apostle, *Let the Bishops be the husbands of one wife*, as a Precept rather than



than a Caution, that they should be husbands of no more then one, which in all likelyhood the truest sense ; in the Sixth Council *In Trullo*, decreed they only should be received into Priestly Orders, who were married. And therefore all antiquity for twelve hundred years together fails them in this, that it was otherwise then voluntary, that married Priests lived from their Wives who had before orders: or that married Men might not be made Priests: though 'tis confessed they preferred unmarried Persons before them, until that Sixth Council, which for that reason amongst others, *Bellarmino* calls a Profane Synod, and *Baronius* impious: such a great veneration have they for the Authority of the Church, when it speaks not their sense.

Yet as we are far from giving an exact and full account of this long controversy here; so are we (so far as I can Divine at the judgment of our Church) willing to accommodate the matter with others, that can digest any thing but their own stout devices, to acknowledge a Power in the Church to bind, or loose her sons of the Clergy, to an unmarried state, or to leave them free. For to aggravate matters to that height as to make it absolute tyranny or Antichristian, and to be against the word of God, which saith *Marriage is honourable in all things*, and the like, implies more of the weakness of the Arguer, than strength in the Argument: more of spite and passion, than ingenuity or soberness. For 'tis answered very sufficiently, marriage is not condemned, but virginity commended before it. Marriage is not at all declared to be evil, when Celibacy is said to be much better. Marriage is not condemned, when certain persons are condemned for marrying. Doth a Father that should cast off his Son for marrying without his liking and approbation, fall into the guilt of those Hereticks, against which the Scripture and Antiquity both make, who simply condemn Marriage in it self as unclean, and evil? No more surely doth that Church which prohibits it conditionally to her children. We hear of many husbands dying who leave their wives such an additional Estate as they could not by any Law challenge, *so long as they continue unmarried*, or upon condition of continuing in the state of widowhood. And so may a Father gratifie and oblige his children if he pleases, without incurring the suspicion of holding marriages unlawful, whatever other censure may pass upon them. And when the Church saith, she will not admit any to minister in her Family, more immediately before God; what doth she say more, than that Master of a Family, who will not have a married servant in his house about him, but likes it very well to use his service in other matters. And does this deserve such noise and out-cries as are made against it? Undoubtedly, it is as free for the Church to judge of persons fit and unfit for her use, as for any Lord or Master whatever: And to make a Law, not absolute that such a thing should not be done; but that none that do such things should be implied in such offices. And what reason is there that Civil Policy shall directly deny this, but Ecclesiastical prudence may not? Are there not many other Societies, as well as Ecclesiastical, which without reproach do the very same thing? Men have a Freedom to do the thing, or not to do it, and more the Scripture hath not left us; but to do it without observing any condition from Superiour, neither the Law of God or Man hath left free. Can there be therefore any more moderate or equal course than so to leave the matter, that the one, singleness of life, shall be commended above the other, and peradventure countenanced and encouraged; but the other, accepted too? Yet neither extream will be content with this. But

one will have a Law to abstract, and the other, as it should seem by their reasons out of Scripture, have it enjoyn'd, though they put a stop to the conclusion, and will not have it contain what, if their Premises be good, it must. For if every Bishop must be the husband of one wife, and every Priest be a Bishop, surely every Priest must marry. And if innocence and purity can be no otherwise maintained, surely the Scripture requiring these, requires that too.

But now we come to the conveniencies and incommodities of the state Virginal and Vidual, in reference to the Clergy. For now, waving the supposition of any Divine injunction, several Divine and Political reasons have been invented sufficient to determine against Priests, some of which being ridiculous, some profane, and some heretical, we shall mention only such as have somewhat of sobriety. The first whereof may be, That it becometh such as attend on so sacred a thing as Gods Altar, to be pure of body and mind too: And therefore to abstain from all fleshly acts. We know how that *Flesh*, in Gods word, goes under suspicion generally of somewhat impure and contrary to spiritualness and true purity: and so, indeed, all fleshliness must be avoided: But in it self, it implies no more than a state of imperfection not inconsistent with, though much inferior to spiritual acts. In the first sense, Covetousness, Ambition, Pride, and such like are Fleshly lusts, no less than Veneries. In the second, Conjugal acts and state are in the sense of the Gospel no more Fleshly, than eating and drinking. But whereas, we find many to have been willing to be mistaken in so colourable a piece of Religion, as to declare even against the natural pollutions (as they may be called) as prejudicial in themselves to spiritual perfection, whether the will concurs thereunto or not, and though proper circumstances be duly observed, I cannot excuse them from Munichæan error wholly; or at least Judaical. And *Zonaras* hath in a learned and sober Treatise on purpose declared the contrary, showing it no more a pollution of the Flesh than a foul nose may: to which I refer the learned; as also to a peculiar Treatise *Chrysostome* hath of Virginitie: where he satisfies both the superstitious and brutish Christian: him; who though he declares against ancient Heresies concerning lawful marriage, yet advances such arguments to commend and prefer Virginitie, which Hereticks were condemned for using: this man, in that he at large disputeth against *Marcion*, *Valentinus*, and *Manes* by name for their excessive magnifying Virginitie, to the absolute condemnation of marriage, and yet withal abounds in the praise and prelation of Virginitie; and sheweth, that it is necessary to hold marriage lawful, and of God, before any man can please God in virginitie. He sheweth first, that no such Heretick as condemns Marriage absolutely shall be rewarded for their pretended purity: He proveth next, They shall be damn'd rather for it: while the Catholicks shall be promoted to the Societies of Angels, become bright Lamps in Heaven, and which is above all, abide with the Bride. He sheweth they are worse than the Heathen Greeks, who so judge of Virginitie and Marriage. *The Gentiles* (saith he) shall surely go to Hell, but yet with this advantage, that they enjoy the pleasures of Marriage, Riches, and other worldly comforts for a time. But Hereticks shall be punished both here and hereafter. Here they are punished by voluntary abstinences; there, by involuntary Plagues. *The Gentiles* shall neither be the better nor worse for their Fastings and Chastities, but Hereticks shall suffer extreame punishment

*Zonaras* apud Leunclavium. Jur. Græco Lat. Tom. 1. p. 351. *Chrysostom.* Περὶ Παρθενίας. Tom. 6. Sermon. 19.

punishment for the things they expected ten thousand thanks. For Fasting and Virginity, are neither good nor evil in themselves, but only according to the choice of them that use them, they may be either. Nay, says he afterwards, the sobriety of Hereticks is much worse then the riotousness of any Heathens. For this only opposes Man, but that fights against God. And afterward; Hereticks professing Chastity, not only pollute their souls but bodies also. And again: He that condemneth marriage injureth Virginity also. And much more to this purpose. Now if after all this, he abounds in the extolling of Virginity above Marriage, making it an Angelical life, at which Puritans are wont to mock and scoff: (which have stood them in more stead then Scripture it self, to make way for their opinions) with what pretense of antiquity can the Levellers, of all orders and states of Christianity, object against Virginal or Vidual Chastity, either as not possible, or not lawful, or not more commendable than a wedded state. And with what hazard of incurring the censure upon ancient Hereticks, do modern Patrons of Chastity raise their building upon their rotten foundations, as too many, who are ashamed of it, do, notwithstanding. Surely this may suffice equal minds, to grant: That as there is a pre-eminence in the state of Virginity, upon true Christian and sober principles, above that of marriage, upon Christian principles likewise; so the state of the Clergy being designed for more high and spiritual acts and ends than others, may be more fit and proper subjects of such Evangelical virtues.

Ἡ ὁ ἡσυχία  
καὶ ἡ παρθενία  
κατὰ τὸν νόμον  
αὐτὸν, καὶ τὸ κα-  
λὸν ἀλλ' ἀπὸ  
τῆς, τῶν μετρί-  
ων τῶν περὶ  
ἐστὶν ἡσυχία.  
Coryll. ib.

Another reason to induce them (for it cannot bind them) to it, is commonly taken from Covetousness, which they say, generally attends the marriage of the Clergy. But doth it more constantly follow upon Priests marriage, than Lay-mens? this would be well known. But Clergy-men must do good with that they have, above other men. It is very true, in all moral and Christian virtues, they ought to exceed others. But we are now enquiring, what evil is in Priests marriage, not what good may be supposed to be done out of that state: And we should farther inform our selves, whether to do more good in the state of Matrimony than others, not Priests; may not competently answer mens reasonable expectations from them. Thirdly, it would be considered, whether singleness of life be such a general cure against Covetousness, as is taken for granted, and whether rather the inward vice doth not incline a man to it, than outward occasions. I know those who have challenged the magnifiers of Clergy-mens single life, being themselves such, to give so many instances of married Priests that were covetous, as they could of unmarried. And in truth there appears to me little difference in the studiousness of Priests (or Lay-men) for their Nephews or near Kindred, and for their own Children: yet should I not deny, but commonly the sollicitude may be greater in behalf of a mans own, then other mens children. A third reason against Priests marriage is the encumbrances of the world, and the cares of a family. But others affirm with great probability, that a wife takes off more cares then she brings to a man; especially him that is of the Clergy, and must keep a Family, as it often happens; and would mind other imployments. And it is very rarely found, that men of that function, who keep house; and consequently are necessitated to keep a woman servant in their house, do void the scandal, if the sin it self of an unchast life. And now I appeal to the judgments & consciences of the Romanists themselves, upon the impartial weighing of both Cases, that of the secular Priests absolut interdiction of marriage, & that of liberty granted to marry: whether



Cassander.  
Consult. c. 23.

they really and faithfully believe there is more chastity in that Church where it is prohibited, or in that where it is permitted? I willingly grant that many, according to their Vows, keep their Vessels in sanctification and honour. But must withal crave leave to presume that so many more walk quite contrary: that it may be feared, God is much more dishonored by imposed Celibacie, than permitted Matrimony: And if so, how can the Church in reason exact an oath of Virginity from all Priests, which tends to the violation of the ends of single life, Chastity? This consideration, *viz.* that the ends and most general event of such laws are quite besides the forms propounded, hath prevailed so far, with the soberer and more judicious of the Roman Church it self, such as *Gerson, Panormitanus, Cassander* and others, who dare not speak their minds so freely, That what was at first wisely and devoutly constituted by the Church, may with no less reason and religion be now reversed. And to this *Cassander* doth add a second reason, the great diversity of the Churches frame now, from what it was when such constitutions or customs rather, at first, prevailed. And to this he adds a third reason for the relaxation of such laws; *viz. From the detriment of the Church, where such Chastity is commanded and rigorously exacted, without such gross connivances as are undeniable: That many sober and eminent persons for learning, and other worths, would be constrained to seek some other course of life than the Priestly; to take that liberty which otherwise they may.* But I shall not need to prosecute this subject any farther than that grave Author hath done, to whom I commend the Reader: concluding, that though it seems very unsafe for men, unserviceable for the Church, unrighteous in the Governors, and not at all to the glory of God, or honor of Religion, to deny entrance to all that refuse a vow of Chastity into the Church; yet, at the worst, it is neither Heretical nor Antichristian, so to do; but tyrannical simply. And it is little better than heretical for any to deny the excellencie of true Virginity, above true Chastity in marriage; or that it is unlawful for any man, upon good advice, to take a vow to persevere in that estate.

Lastly, in answer to such (for too many now adays of such are to be found) who may well be thought to deliver their opinions against the marriage of the Clergy, out of Policy rather than Piety; and out of spite and envy, that they should enjoy any thing of the world which pleases them so well; rather than out of any sincere wishes to Religion or the Church, saying, *It is not fit Ministers should marry. What should they do with Wives?* and a great deal of high and boisterous stuff, to this purpose; I shall refer them that argue out of conscience and sincerity, for satisfaction to what is spoken already about this: But to the pretended States-man I shall offer this consideration, That all politickly given (as almost who is not that hath been at a Coffee-house?) do lay it down as a Rule of their Politicks, the encrease of People in the Nation: Now a general complaint being made of want of People in his Majesties Dominions, can they look on it as nothing, or no prejudice to the Civil State, that twenty thousand persons (for so many, and more I may well number of the Clergy in all his Majesties Dominions) should be restrained from lawful marriage, and adding of people to the Nations under him? For my part, I use not this argument but to show the vanity and madness of certain loose tongu'd persons, who regard little what they say against Religion, and those related more immediately to it, so that sometimes you shall hear from them somewhat religiously (as it were) spoken, when they intend thereby to mischive and abuse it. But I hope it will not be displeasing to them, if we acknowledge that *Holy Orders* do bring a man into  
such

such a peculiar state of serving God, and obliging of self-denial, and dedication of himself to God, in not only sober, but severe living, and not only severe, but spiritual; that what either of Precept is required of other Christians or of Counsel obliges them, do much more firmly bind a Priest. And of this, the ancient and holy Fathers have written so much, that to add were hard at any time, and to alledge unreasonable at present. Yet shall I crave leave to end with this disputation of *St. Chrysostome* thus rendred. *Thou thy self, saith the Heretick* (against whom he had before argued) *forbiddest marriage. By no means. Far be it, I should be as mad as you: How then dost thou exhort me to marry? Because I am perswaded that Virginity is much better than marriage, I do not therefore place marriage amongst evil things, but I commend it highly. For it is the haven of Continence, to such as will use it aright, not permitting nature to be outrageous. For prefixing, as bounds, lawful mixture, and hereby receiving the waves of Lust, it secures and preserves us in great calmness. But some there are, who not wanting this safeguard, instead of this, do tame the madness of Nature by fastings and watchings, lodging on the ground, and such like hard usage: These I exhort not to marry, not forbidding them to marry. But there is a vast distance between these two, even as great as there is between necessity and choice. For he that advises, suffers his heaven to be master of the choice of his own matters, concerning which he gives counsel: but he that forbiddeth, taketh away from him this power. Moreover, I do not, in exhorting, do wrong to the [other] thing: nor do I condemn him that is not perswaded by me. But you speaking evil, and calling it wicked, and taking upon you the person of a Law-giver, and not of a Counsellor, in all likelihood do hate those that will not be perswaded by you. But I nothing so; but admire such as list themselves for this combat; but I accuse not them who continue out of this conflict. For then only doth accusation take place, when a man tends to that which is naught. But he that attains to the less good, not arriving at the greater, deprives himself of the praise and admiration, which the other hath, but deserves not to be blamed. How then do I forbid marriage, not blaming them that marry? I forbid fornication. I forbid Adultery, but not at all, marriage. These indeed that practise such things I punish, and drive them from the Body of the Church: But those that do this, if they contain, commending I advance. For thus two benefits arise: One, that Gods Institution is not slandered: Another, that the dignity of Virginity is not taken away; but rather appears much more honorable. Thus far he, and much more in the following discourse, against both the condemners of Marriage, and contemners of Virginity.*

*Chrysost. ubi  
supra.*

## CHAP. VI.

*Of the third state of serving God, a Life Monastical. That it is not only lawful, but may be profitable also. The Exceptions of Mr. Perkins against it, examined. The Abuses of Monastical Life touched. That it is lawful to Vow such a kind of Life, duly regulated.*

**T**HE last state of worshipping God, which we mentioned, is that of Separation from the world, and devoting a mans self more entirely to the fulfilling the high ends of Christian Religion, under the wise, sober, and strict Discipline drawn out of the Word of God, and compleated from the wise and holy Rules and Observations of Gods most faithful, holy, and renowned Servants. This state of life is by a current Antinomiasie signal-ly and peculiarly called *Religion*: which name may seem to imply much of Arrogance and Pride, if it be so given to that State, as to undervalue the secular state of serving God, as not worthy the name of Religion, compared with that, commonly called *Regular*. But if no more be thereby intended than a certain degree of living holily to God and his service, that presumption may be passed over. For according to its first Institution and Intention, no question can fairly and reasonably be made of the excellent use and ends thereof; it being no other than *Thomas* describes it to be, *viz. Status Penitentiae & contemptus mundi: A state of repenting and contempt of the world*. And as we may so speak, that though men of one profession may sometimes do the work as well, and sometimes better, of another trade, than he whose proper calling it is; yet this is no rule to deny it needful to be bound to such a Trade; so in Religion, no doubt is to be made, but many living in the *world* (as they speak) may exceed in holiness and devotion diverse who live secluded, as to outward profession, from the world; yet this is no good argument to conclude therefore such a life is vain and needless, much less that it is superstitious, and worse then I will say after some light heads and loose tongues. For in truth it is the trade to which Monastical persons are bound all their lives; the more constant and spiritual service of God: And if they do not profit more therein then other persons conversing in the world more busily, they are worthily to be condemn'd as well by Man as God. But as before, against the Clergy, against vowed Celibacie, so here against Monastick life, for men to rake in the Canals for durt and filth taken from single persons, to cast in the face of the Orders themselves; and to cry not only them down, but all the most eminent servants of Christ from the most primitive Ages and downwards for many Ages, who have either been so *Ascetical* themselves, or unanimously approved

Thomas 22.  
Qu. 187. 6. co.



approved and magnified the same, is extream folly and insolence, as St. *Augustine* in like case calls it.

Many things objected against this state are in common with Vows and Virginity: of which we have spoken, and therefore now pass over. And do moreover grant such to have been the corruptions and abuses of that holy state of late years, yea, for some Generations past, that the hand of God was justly against them, but not so the hand of Man: And were it so that the like depravations of the ends were inseparable from them, the Church might be as holy without them. But God forbid any man should think men may not live at least as civilly and soberly in Monasteries as in private Families, or Kings Courts; which, I hope, ought not to be ruined and destroyed for abuses their reigning. St. *Ambrose* in an Epistle calls Monasteries *The shops of Vertue, Abstinence, Fasting, Patience, and Labours*, &c. Yet St. *Austin* speaketh thus clearly and ingenuously of them, in an Epistle likewise: *I speak unfeignedly to your Goodness, before our Lord God, whom I call to record upon my soul; since the time I began to serve God, that as I could scarce find any better than such as have profited in Monasteries, so have I no where found any worse than they who in Monasteries have fallen.* Yet, though this were granted, they never took up an opinion against Monastick life, absolutely. A few years since (saith *Austin* in another Epistle) there arose at Rome one *Jovinian*, who is said to have perswaded certain holy Nuns, even grown into years, to marry, not enticing them so far as to take any of them to wife; but by arguing that Virgins devoted to holiness, found no greater reward from God than faithful married persons. For such his opinion *Jovinian* fared never the better amongst the primest Fathers of the Church: and still we hold to this Rule not easily to lend an ear to modern Reformers, how eminent soever, against the torrent of more eminent Fathers of the Church.

There are three things specially to be observed in Monastick Life, according to which we may judge of the reasonableness and piety of the same: 1. The Original. 2. The Form or Manner of Living. 3. The End and Effects of it. Surely the Original was very ancient, though not to be fetched so far backward as *Elias* or *John* the Baptist; though *Sozomen* would from thence derive it. And no wonder, if others of later years, have been of that mind. It is generally agreed amongst Writers, that the Hermites or Anachorets of *Agypt*, first professed such separations from men: partly out of pure Devotion; and partly (not wholly, as some suppose) upon the violent persecutions raised in those parts in those early days. But afterward those dispersed persons began to gather together in companies and societies. St. *Chrysostome* in a certain Homily assures us, that in St. *Paul's* dayes not the least foot-step of a Monk was to be found. Before St. *Basil's* time (saith *Polydore Virgil*) Monks were left to their own liberty, and so were Nuns too, to continue in, or relinquish that state, as they pleased; as appears from many instances might be given. But such as had once professed or pretended such a state, and after deserted it, were judged by all most infamous, and fear of shame had the force of a Vow upon them: nevertheless, St. *Basil* brought them into a Society, propounded Rules unto them, and brought them under that threefold Vow of Chastity, Obedience, and Poverty, which hath continued unto this day. Yet there are not wanting some, as *Lambertus Schafnaburgensis*, who complaining of the new Orders of Monks brought in by *Dominick* and *Francis*, have thought it safer to be free from such bonds as have been cast upon men, beyond their ability to endure.

*Deus meritis  
contemptum  
effudit in  
Monachos  
propter vitia.*  
Vide Schaf-  
naburger. de  
Rebus Ger-  
man. Ann.  
1071.  
Ambros. 10.  
Epist. 82.  
*Quid enim ali-  
ud fuisse Mo-  
nasteria quam  
officina virtutis.*  
Et August.  
Epist. 137.  
*Simpliciter  
autem fiteor  
charitati re-  
sistere coram  
Domino Deo,*  
&c.  
Aug. Ep. 16.

*Sozomenus  
Hist. Eccles.  
lib. 1. cap. 12.*

*Ὁυδὲ γὰρ ἔχ-  
νους τότε μονά-  
χους ἦν,  
ἀλλὰ πρὸς  
κοσμητικὸν δὲ  
ἀγέλης ὁ μα-  
κάριος ἦν.*  
Chrys. Sermon.  
25 in Hebraeos  
Polyd. Virg.  
de Invent.  
lib. 7. c. 2.  
Schafnaburg.  
de Rebus  
German. Anno  
1025.

But

Perkins Demonstration  
of the Problem, p. 594,  
595.

But what should I add to what, upon this subject, hath been so largely and learnedly treated of by others? Only the Popery of this state of Life is it which has brought an ill name upon the thing it self. But the exception is too general, trivial, and trite, to move knowing and sober Christians, though it may go far with such as have nothing from their Lecturer, with whom the Scripture it self is of no other use, than such shall please to apply it unto. Who can deny but Popish corruptions have tainted the purity and simplicity of former Ages, in the regiment of Monks? But those most of them which Perkins instances in, are too light to bring the thing into disgrace and utter dislike. *And such are Copes, and Cowles, and other Monkish Habits; as also Quire-singing, Vowed Fasts, and choice Meats.* Against which, Mr. Perkins his pains had been better spar'd than spent. For as it is necessary that all orders in the Common-wealth should be distinguished accordingly, and their Habits are proper cognizances for that purpose; and none but Artisans, and such persons that are neither Gentlemen, nor in any place of Honour or Power, malign such a distinction: So should the several orders and professions be preserved, and appear distinct by their outward garb, to advertise them of their duty and profession; and awe them, before the eyes of all men, to a walking conformable to their profession, others to be subject to just censures and reprehension of men, and none but low and ignoble Christians do malign and oppose them. And that it should be indecent, or as they would fain, but in vain quarrel with such outward Habits, unlawful, is ridiculous to affirm, and a greater argument of more superstition lurking in the souls of these scandalized persons, than can be found in the thing accused. But to except against Quire-singing, is not only frivolous, but impious, without limitation. And choice of meats, and especially Fastings vowed are as far out of their power to disprove soberly, as it is out of their will to pretend to, or imitate.

Perkins, *ibid.*

Basilus M.  
Regul. Fuf.  
Disput. 7.

But there are some things here called fundamental, differing ancient Monks from the present. *First, They lived solitarily of necessity to be safer from persecution.* This is not true in all. *Secondly, They were not constrained to give all that they had to the poor.* But where lyes the accusation here? In constraining, or being constrained? We now speak of the Monastick person, and I hope it is no sin in him to suffer such, or greater violence: as to the Injurer, let him look to it. And in truth I do not determine any thing in this case. To the Fourth, that Monks were not then bound to any certain Rules; it is answered in part already; that while they lived separate, and were not form'd into a Society, it was not so requisite. But St. Basil doth show how much better it is to live *in cenobio*, in company with others, than Hermite-like to skulk in holes, or wander up and down in deserts. And that first, because there is an *ἀνταρραχία* (as he calls it) a self-pleasingness in such free solitariness: and, Secondly, *such keep shut up without exercise, that ability they have, being ignorant as well of their own defects, as of others proficiencie.* There are causes enough besides such pitiful exceptions above mentioned, to condemn the most irregular constitutions of such *Regulars* as are thick sown in the Roman Church. I might begin with the excessive number of them, to the prejudice of such states where they are planted. I might proceed to the nature of them, and horrible looseness tolerated in them, of which so many Authors have too justly complained; and continue to declare the intolerable strictness of some, either requiring a gross Dispensation to the voiding of the express will of their Founder, or to the shortning the dayes of many persevering in the rigorous

rigorous observation of them. The very rules likewise themselves are, many times, most superstitious. And above all, the foul usurpation the Pope of *Rome* hath over them, to the disobliging them from their proper Bishops, and thereby making them Schismatics, and himself a Tyrant, it being certain, that of old, both by course, consequence, custome, and Canons of the Church, all Monasteries and Religious Societies were, and still ought to be subject to the Bishop of that Place where their Site was. And to this purpose is there express provision made by a Council of *Mentz* in the middle age of the Church, under *Charles* the Great, in the ninth Chapter, that the Monks of Religious Houses should be subject to their proper Bishop, and do nothing without his approbation. But it is one thing to plead in general for the lawfulness and expedience of Monastick Life, and that of both sexes; and another to deliver laws and due prescriptions for the well disciplining of them: which is the work of the wisest heads and sincerest hearts to Religion, to be here passed over.

There may yet seem somewhat due to an objection against the said state taken from the vow exacted from such as enter themselves into it: which no wonder that they who oppose so blindly the thing it self, should much more oppose. But they who approve of it, can find little reason to quarrel at that bond. And that first, because such Monastick Life is not alwaies in Society, which they call Convents, but may be undertaken at a mans own pleasure, both for time and place and other circumstances: every Christian having power to dispose of himself (not prejudicing the general right and interest of his Governours over him) to what life he pleases, and with what circumstances. But if a man resolves to become a member of some special Society, already formed by certain Rules and Laws; to desire to be matriculated into that Body, and not to be willing to conform to the constitutions of it, is unjust and unreasonable. And so likewise, not to give that outward and common assurance of faithful submission unto the same, by an Oath of Vow. For do men think it reasonable, that Prentises should be bound to be true, faithful, and keep their Masters secrets, even before they know them, and when they know them to be none of the justest or honestest; or shall men that enter but into civil Companies, be it but of Merchant-Taylers or Barber-Surgeons, be constrained by Oath to be true and faithful to them, but they who are admitted into Religious Societies, be left to do and live as the please? What were this but to seek an occasion, under colour of friendliness and good affection, to divide and destroy it? as is apparent in the seemingly modest pretenses of dissenters and disaffected persons to our Church: who upon condition that they may give and reverse certain orders and laws, offer themselves to become one with it: Thus the Vulgar take it, but in truth, it is for the Church to be one with them. And is not this a notable piece of modesty, condescension, and compliance? But here let that rest; as also what we have to say of the second thing generally to be consider'd in the Worship of God, *viz.* The state of serving God.



## CHAP. VII.

*Of Religious Worship, the third thing considerable in it, viz. The Exercise of it, in the several kinds of it: And first of Prayer the chiefest Act of Gods Worship: contrary to Sectaries who are Enemies to it in three respects. And first by their vain conceit of Preaching, wherein consisteth not the proper Worship of God, as in Prayer.*

**T**HE third thing wherein the worship of God may be said yet more properly to consist, is the *Kinds of Worship*: And these we shall reduce to three; Prayer, Preaching, and Obedience in the due exercise of all Christian Graces and Virtues, wherein the Life of Faith properly consisteth. And first we shall begin with prayer, as that wherein was ever thought the worship of God principally to consist, be that Religion Christian or Unchristian; unless we be forced to except some modern and immodest pretenders to Reformation. For though they keep within such bounds, as a grave and judicious defender of our Church says, none ever exceeded, not to deny prayer absolutely, yet have they brought it to that pass, so humbled and diluted it, that there is little place found for it, and less value. And surely, were they but true to their own principles and arguments, no use at all would they acknowledge of prayer, more then certain Heathens and Hereticks whose arguments must needs be accepted by them, if they will believe conformable to themselves.

Hieronymus  
in Matth.  
cap. 6. 8.

Clemens A.  
lexa. Strom. 7

St. Hierome upon Matthew tells us, *There is sprung up here a certain Heresie and Dogme of Philosophers, who say, If God knows what we pray for, and that we have need of such things as we desire before we ask, in vain we speak to him, who knows all before. To whom (saith he) we answer, That we do not so much tell God what we would have, as begg of him.* Clemens Alexandrinus likewise tells us, that one Prodius was Authour of that Opinion. Thus far profane Sectaries amongst us have not generally proceeded, though we have been credibly informed that some have. However, they unanimously conspire to debase prayer, and corrupt Christian worship it self in these three Respects. First, in advancing preaching much inferiour to it, in a Church become Christian, infinitely before it. Secondly, by opposing *Set, or Prescribed* Forms of Prayer. And thirdly, in expunging the Lords Prayer out of their uncertain and wild Liturgies. Which the Presbyterian Sect, the Sire of all others, was not a little guilty of; and so seldome used it, that being demanded why they left it out in their prayers, thought good to give such a modest reason as this,

this, They feared they should be out in the recitation of it: so had they accustomed their tongues to liberty, and variety of words. But they had other reasons which they were ashamed to utter, but to their trusty friends.

But let us first see how preaching transcends prayer, and hath insulted and trampled over it. For such have been the extreams of late, that whereas formerly the Proverb was, *No Penny no Pater Noster*: now, *No Preaching no Pater Noster*: No Sermon, no Prayer in Gods House. And whereas it was said by our Saviour Christ of old, and by the Prophet before him, *My House shall be called* (which almost every ordinary man knows according to the Hebrew Idiom, is the very same with *shall be*) *the House of Prayer unto all Nations*; and never was it called or accounted a preaching house, but by them that called it a Steeple-house, and little otherwise judged of it; now have things been so reformed with a witness, or rather a vengeance, that Sermoning carries all afore it, bears all down to little or nothing.

Matth. 21. 3. 7

But what if all this while preaching be not the worshipping of God at all? Will they continue so obstinate as to make it almost the only thing in Gods house? That they, who with strange boldness profess, and in constant practise declare they will have nothing to do with Gods house, as Gods house, but only as a Vestry-house, when they are to take the Parish Accompts, unless there be a Sermon, do hold that Sermoning active and passive, preach'd and heard, is the main matter of Religion, and worship of God, is apparent and undenyable; and that it is only for the Sermons sake, that ever they meet as Christians in the Church. Now, if it doth appear that this sort of Religion is no worship of God at all, and that God is not served at all by that, by which they imagine they serve him entirely, what becomes of these mens Christianity it self? For Christian Religion, as this whole work proves, consists of Doctrine and Worship: and if they have not both of them, they cannot be Christians. And if they have no prayer, they have no worship; and if they rest on preaching, as that which contains all, they loose all. For in making, or hearing a Sermon, we serve not God at all, in propriety of speech, but rather he serves us.

I confess we have propounded preaching, as one of the kinds of worship; but intended not so to do as equalling it with that of prayer: but only reductively and remotely so calling it: as that whose end it is that God should be worshipped, and no other at all: And that which ministers good matter, and prescribes excellent manners and rules of worship, may by a figure, not unusual, be called the thing which it so promotes, but in strictness of speech, it is not; nor in its own nature: the reasons whereof may be these.

First, Because all true worship of God consisteth necessarily in somewhat of action, and not in meer passiveness. But hearing of Sermons, and so reading of Scriptures, or other good Books, have nothing of Divine action in them; but the person therein concerned is meerly passive, and suffers somewhat, it may be, with patience and content to be done unto him, but himself does nothing. There is indeed somewhat of a natural act in writing Sermons, and reading Books, but this action is not, nor can properly be directed to God, but to a mans own self, that he may make himself more capable of that benefit which he seeks thereby to himself: but this is to give nothing to God, but still to be of the taking hand from him: But in all proper worship we are to exercise some act towards God: For hearing is not doing.

E e e 2

And

Prov. 28.9.

*Vis scire quam  
pretiosa sit O-  
ratio? Nulla  
iustitia Thy-  
miamati assi-  
milatur nisi  
Oratio. Opus  
Imperfectum  
in Matthæum,  
Hom. 13.  
Exod. 23. 15.*

And secondly, All worship of God requires somewhat exhibited unto God as our service due naturally to him, but in hearing of Sermons, we render nothing at all to him: therefore we serve him not at all; but rather we receiving those blessed means of serving him and attaining grace here, and glory hereafter, He, at whose appointment and charge this is done to us, doth serve us, and do us honour, and not we him: though as (he that scornfully turns his back and stops his ear against the words of his betters) we may be said to dishonour and sin against him, if we refuse to hear his Law: according to that of Solomon, *He that turneth away his ear from hearing the Law, even his prayer shall be an abomination*: though I take the true intent of these words to be of obeying, and living according to the Law of God, and as much as if it had been said, *He that liveth wickedly, and breaketh Gods commands* (which is not to hear it) *his prayers shall not be accepted of God*. But still the true service of God consists in offering something to him: there being no difference in the nature of the Service or Sacrifice given to God under the Gospel, from that under the Law, but only in the matter. This was material and corporal; that is to be spiritual; but yet an offering. God laid a charge upon his people of old, *Thou shalt not appear before the Lord empty*: Meaning surely, that none should believe they had done their duty in any competent manner, when they came to the Temple, and there saw what was done, lik'd it well enough, heard what was said, but offered nothing themselves: God would have no such service. But such like service do they give to God, who come to Church and only hear a Sermon: for they come empty to him, and perhaps to be filled with good things, but what, think we, will that stand for, when he requires that we should be offerers, as well as receivers, and doers as well as sufferers? And whereas in the true spiritual Sacrifice, we pray to God; In preaching, according to the language of the Scriptures, God prays to us. For saith the Apostle to the *Corinthians*, *Now then we are Embassadors for Christ, as though God did beseech you by us, we pray you in Christs stead to be reconciled to God*. And truly, God often complains of the empty and superficial service of the lip without the heart; but yet even that, as dilute a thing as it is, hath much more of worship of God, than hath hearing of Sermons. For that is an outward part, but this is neither outward nor inward.

Rom. 10. 17.

Thirdly, The means only of serving of God is not the service of God it self, no more than the means is the end. They whose religion lies in preaching and hearing, do very aptly and currently call Sermons the *Means*, in a signal sense. I suppose they intend thereby *the Means* to Salvation, and *Means of Grace*: and so indeed, Teaching and Instruction are, according to that special place upon which all their good opinion of Sermons above prayer is grounded: *viz. Faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the Word of God*. 'Tis most certain: but must that which is first in order, be likewise first in honour too? Or that which is most necessary, be most excellent? Yea, that which is excellent only as a way and means, carry it from the end which it serves, and is designed to? This is supposed, or nothing is concluded: but this is weakly taken for granted, and therefore the conclusion from thence must needs be weak and pitiful. The Grace of Nature, which I call Reason, is much more necessary in the ordinary way of Gods saving us, then the Grace of the Gospel, Faith: because without that humane apprehension of what is delivered, no man can believe what is said: and so the hearing of the Ear, than Reason, because Reason depends upon it: and so doth Faith on preaching, and the worship of God on preaching going before



fore and directing to do it aright, is it therefore any more then they, the worthier? or is it at all the very service of God? The quite contrary is easily proved from this very reason: seeing it must necessarily be, that the End is much more desirable than the Means: and preaching is accounted rightly but as the *Means* to the means of Grace and Salvation, believing & doing the will of God; as St. *Augustine* hath in a certain place rightly observed.

But before we can appropriate the worship of God to prayer in contradistinction to preaching, an Objection must be here noted, which calls in question prayer it self, as incapable of that little. For they may say that in prayer we offer not so much to God, as we receive from him. For prayer is a begging of favour and benefits of God. To which our Answer is, that taking prayer strictly and precisely for that one part of prayer, which consisteth in craving a supply of our wants, or deprecation only, then indeed this is not so properly a Sacrifice. But we are to take prayer in its usual latitude, for all the parts of it: such as Confession, Deprecation of Evil, Petition of Good, Agnition, and Profession of Mercies received, Thanksgiving & Praise for all Gods hand of Grace towards us, and thus prayer is the offering up of a spiritual Sacrifice to God. An offering of our heart, and an assent of the soul to God, as some devout men and learned have defined it: And not so only, but in effect and intention, it, by acknowledging of the free mercie of God in outward or inward blessings received from him, is the rendring of them all to him again, and a Sacrifice of that back again, which once he conferred on us. Thirdly, prayer, and worship so properly called, bear the name of Sacrifices, from the ground of all prayers, though some parts of prayer be not so expressly such. For he that acknowledges the Omnipotence of God, the Omniscience, Omnipresence, the Alisufficiencie, doth thereby render unto God his due, but he that prayeth unto God, supposeth, and confesseth, and implicitly offers all these, as his duty to God. But whoever heard of Offering up the Sacrifice of a Sermon unto God? For,

Lastly, If there be any thing of worship or the nature of a Sacrifice in Sermons; certainly great Idolatry is committed by them; it being most manifest that preaching is offered to Man, and not to God: and if it be a Divine worship, what can it be less? For what is more true and common then this, That in prayer men speak to God, but in preaching they speak to man. So that from hence we may safely conclude that, that Religion which hath nothing to commend it but preaching, or nothing so much as preaching, is quite contrary to the Apostle, *Whose praise is not of God but of Men*: and in truth deserves not so much the Name of Religion as of Superstition, unheard of, unthought of, until of late years, and coming nearest to that grossest part of truly Popish Superstition, or as some call it Sacrilege, communicating in one kind.

But here it will be warmly interposed and replied; God forbid they should oppose praying: it is a manifest slander. For these good people have prayers in private, and prayers in publick too. It is no proper place now, by and by it will be, to examine what manner of prayers & worship these they mean, are; insufficient (God knows) to the constituting of a Church in true Christian communion: But here we tell them, that we have not disputed against them as having no worship of God at all; But first, that at all they make preaching and hearing Sermons, a proper part of Gods service: Secondly, that they make it the most eminent and chief: against both which our reasons stand good still: And that they so do, is demonstrated from their practise, no less than Doctrines: in that they never (amongst us) pray in publick, never enjoy Christian communion, but by vertue of a Sermon.

And

Ὁμιλία πρὸς  
τὸ Θεόν, ἢ  
εὐχὴ, &c.  
Clemens A-  
lexand.  
Εὐχὴ δὲ τὴν ἡ-  
μῶν ζωῆς βο-  
ήθεια ὁμιλία  
πρὸς Θεόν.  
ἀνθρ. τὴν γνη-  
σίων ἀποδοξ-  
πρὸς ἑράνον.  
Asterius apud  
Phœtium,

And though being pressed hard, they confess with much ado (as *Cartwright* against Bishop *Whitgift*) that it is possible and valid to celebrate the Sacraments of Baptism and Eucharist, without a Sermon; yet it seems so notoriously inconvenient and incongruous, as it ought never to be done, where the Sermon is possible to be had. A foul and ungodly mistake. So that we have done them no wrong as yet.

## CHAP. VIII.

*A second Corruption of the worship of God, not, especially in Prayer: by opposing Set-forms of Publick Worship. Reasons against Extemporary Prayers in Publick: The Places of Scripture, and Reasons and Antiquity for Extemporary Prayers, answered.*

**A** Second thing whereby they have abused both the holy duty of prayer, and well-meaning Christians, is in their traducing and prophanation of all prescribed forms of prayer, wherein they forget not to shew themselves in their arts and colours.

For when the power is in their hands, and their Faction can domineer, then do they condemn directly in word, by preaching, printing, and covenanting solemnly against Set-forms in publick: and there hath been nothing under heaven acted by them more industriously than the utter abolition of all such Divine Offices. And when they can go no farther, their Chariots wheels are taken off, and they begin to find themselves to sink: that they bethink themselves how possibly they may stand in need of that moderation that they contemned, and that indulgence they condemned, their study is, not how to repent and retract absolutely their former ungodly counsels and practises (as all good Christians that meant seriously to be saved, ought to do) but with what artifices, they may, at the same time, hold to their old principles of mischief to others, and save themselves from harm from others. For we must not say now, they did any thing so disorderly (good people that they are, and innocent) against Set-forms: but the Parliament (as they are obstinately bent to grace their cause, without any ground for such a title) say they, call'd them to it: when of the two, they, if we may distinguish them from their pretended Parliament (for which there is no ground) rather called their Parliament to such counsels and pranks, as they after play'd; as appeareth by their early *Smectymnus*, and their incessant instances with them to pursue those Schismatical Dogms, to the subverting of all received Discipline, and forms of Worship. And that they have disowned their principles, upon which they then proceeded, we find not; though we have more than enough of tricks and turnings, and

and windings, and straining them to the fairest sense they can possibly bear, and sometimes farther too. For instance, they say now, their Covenant was not against Episcopal Government; but an Hierarchy. They say, They are not against Set forms; for they suffer them in private. Nay, they say, they are no enemies to publick Forms, nor many other Rites; but they would not have them imposed upon any. But we shall presume to tell them, we neither believe the one nor other; until they as publicly retract what they have done in deposing all Set forms, and taught and writ, and imposing Unset forms upon all that would live by them. And in that they would not have them now imposed, they imply more strongly they are against them wholly, than they express they any wayes favour them; when, God be thanked, as ill as at present it is, it is not in their power to oppose and damn them, as formerly. Can there be any thing more ridiculous than for men to do as much mischief as possibly they can, and then to say, They are not for doing any more, or going any farther. Which yet we might without censure of stupidity believe, but that they stand to their Arms still, though it be no time to use them, yet: and their reasons, which in brief are these, they hold not yet unreasonable.

They say, First, it was alwayes permitted to the Minister to *modifie* (their own word) the worship of God. And therefore they ought not to be prescribed; now, any such Forms as are propounded and enjoyed.

Will they stand to their principle, *viz.* That nothing is now to be altered, which hath prevailed much more generally and anciently, than this pretended Liberty of the Minister? Alas, it will not be endured by themselves, it will prove too hot for them, it will make too much havock amongst their best Innovations. But we pardon, and pass by their incogitancies in that, and the like grounds; in ordering which, they are seldom so solicitous how to secure themselves, as intent how to wound their Enemies. But we more openly profess the contrary to that they take here for granted: and say, *It was never permitted Ministers to make any private Prayers of their own, in the publick Assemblies of Christians, since there was a cessation of those miraculous gifts,* which St. Chrysostome affirms, upon this occasion, to have been extinct, so long before his dayes, that St. Paul's words to the *Romans*, from whence some would fetch extemporary prayers were very obscure; it being unknown what was the practise of the Church then. *χαρισματα*, Gifts, he grants there were, at the first; but knew nothing of such in his dayes: nor well understood, as himself professes, what manner of ones they were when they were in use. In the next place we shall enquire farther after them. Here we stick to this unshaken foundation, That there is no footstep of Record or Monument in the Church of God, whereby they can make it probable, that in the solemn and set Assemblies of Christians constantly observed (for as for inferiour, and voluntary, and undetermined meetings, they can be no rule to us at all; though something more than we can find, should be alledged against us) it was never allowed the Priest (whom I suppose they mean by Minister, though this word before they were pleased to reform the language, as well as manners of the Church signified properly the Deacon) to utter any thing of his own, or indeed others composing, whether premeditated or extemporary, without the approbation of his Bishop first had; I mean in the matter of Prayer, which we now speak of. So that I wonder much, how any such bold and untrue Axiome could ever enter into their minds, as that Ministers might of themselves *modifie* the worship of God.

Chrysost. in  
Rom. 8.

But



Rom. 8.

1 Cor. 14. 15.

Rom. 8.

But the second argument of theirs, taken from Scripture, may perhaps a little relieve them: where we read in St. Paul to the Romans, *That the Spirit helpeth our infirmities: for we know not what we should pray for as we ought, but the Spirit it self maketh intercession for us with groanings which cannot be uttered.* And the same Apostle to the Corinthians saith, *I will pray with the Spirit, and I will pray with the understanding also: I will sing with the Spirit, and I will sing with the understanding also.* To both which, we answer, wondering with what presumption they take for granted, that, where ever the Spirit of prayer is mentioned, is intended conceived prayer, and not that formed to our hands. We grant, not only that there is a Spirit of prayer, but that this Spirit is necessary to have our prayers well ordered and accepted. But we are far from granting, that the Spirit's office must be so pitiful as to suggest words, and eloquent affecting phrases. No such matter. The Spirit assisteth and enableth us to pray, in sanctifying our minds and hearts: in giving us the grace of prayer, and causing us to put up fervent and spiritual cries to God, even in such words as we may have prayed over a thousand times, without spiritual affections, which alone can render a prayer accepted. And when the Spirit thus enables us to pray, it self is said to make intercession for us, as being the principal Agent. But it is said also, *We know not what we ought to pray for:* and therefore surely there must be more in the work of the Spirit than giving the due manner and grace of prayer. I may well say that St. Paul speaks not at all of publick prayer (as I confess he doth in his words to the Corinthians) but of private, single, and occasional Ejaculations, which I shall grant, as much as they modestly can demand, may be the gift of the Spirit, as well as the Grace (as they are wont, not very warrantably to distinguish, as we may see by and by: ) but we are now speaking, and the Controversie is wholly, about set, and constant, and publick occasions, and common to the whole body of the Church assembled together, and concerning this, we deny utterly, that either St. Paul ever intended we should depend upon the motions of Gods Spirit to frame a Prayer for that use: or that a prayer unform'd and unknown is so much as to be endur'd in the Church, where Christian communion is to be enjoyed. But secondly, we answer, That the Spirit doth sufficiently teach them to pray, who never pretend to pray extemporany: yea, perhaps that never pray at all. We know not what we should pray for as we ought. Therefore the Spirit which hath given us the Word of God, and thereby revealed unto us the hidden things of God, and what his will is, hath withal sufficiently assisted in that particular, our Ignorances and Infirmities, and taught us, what we should pray for? What more can we expect reasonably from these words? I am sure not Extemporarinefs.

And to the *praying with the understanding, and praying with the Spirit also, and singing with the Spirit, and singing with the understanding also*; whence they infer there is a praying by the Spirit, above the ordinary reason, and apprehension of men; we answer, First, It is certain the words are not well rendred according to the drift of the Apostle, which was, to argue, that both in preaching and praying in publick, men should not abuse the gift of tongues granted them by the Spirit, as to sing, pray, or preach before the assembly of Christians, in such tongues, as were not by them understood. And therefore (as the Original will warrant it) *τῷ νοῷ*, should be translated *To the understanding*: not of himself that spake, but of them that heard. For amongst the Spiritual persons of the Gospel were not to be found such, as amongst the heathens were inspired to speak they knew not what, they understood

understood not : but undoubtedly all knew what they said, who spake by the Spirit of Tongues ; but others often did not : and therefore St. Paul exhorteth there, that whoever were so gifted as to speak in unknown tongues, they should either be altogether silent, or speak by one or two Interpreters : and this is all they can make of these words, as the words going before and after plainly demonstrate.

But to Ecclesiastical antiquity they have recourse next ; and from *Justin Martyr* they argue a Liberty to Priests to model the worship of God : because he saith (the place is known well enough) that the President of the Assemblies *ἐκ δεξιῶν*, according as he is able, prays. But that this publick Officer was a Presbyter or Priest, and not the Bishop himself, is more than they can prove, though it lyes upon them. For I make no scruple to grant but it was free for the Bishop, who is the highest power in the Church, to alter several things in the form of worship, and to make forms of Prayer, according to the exigence of that Church he presided over, but never was any such thing allowed to the Presbyter ; and no longer to the Bishop, than a form of publick Worship was agreed to, and received : which we confess was not until the Gifts of Miracles were ceased, and then, not all at an instant, but by degrees, and by orderly consultation, and good authority, as occasion offered. There might also be some Liberty, even after such provision made for the solemn service of God, by some presumptuous Priests taken to deviate from such Prescriptions, but that ever it was left free to them to use, or not to use the same ; or to add, or detract from them, no where appeareth. The Council of *Milevis in Africa*, provideth by a Canon against such perhaps growing presumption, but not then first made it absolutely unlawful ; as it is cited to that purpose, by Sectaries.

And as for *Tertullian*, who affirmeth it to have been the custom in Christian assemblies, for certain persons to come forth, and sing Hymns to God, out of the Holy Scriptures, or their own Wits : I understand him rather of the Actions in the *Agape* or *Love-Feasts*, which were wont to be distinct from, and kept after the more solemn and proper Ecclesiastical service : And in such cases (spending the time religiously also) it might be lawful for private men, whether Ecclesiastical persons, or otherwise (for his words make no more for Priests than Laymen ; and upon that very ground can avail them but little, that draw them to their Ministers only) to show their Poetical Gifts (whether *extempore* or premeditate, no matter or mention is made) in the praising God. But finding in *Philo Judæus*, a description of the Ascetical Jews, which were mostly of the Sect of the *Essens*, to have such practises amongst them also ; I make no doubt but such things might be first drawn from them, as many ancient Ceremonies of the Christians were ; and that by the countenance of the Apostles themselves (however simpler Zealots will scarce endure to hear so much :) and continued without prejudice to the more solemn and publick worship. For scarce do the leading Sectaries pretend to such Gifts of the Spirit, as should enable their wits to make Hymns extemporary ; or so much as bring in a new Psalm or Hymn into their Assemblies, unknown or unheard of to the commoner sort. Surely their modesty herein, that they have not dared as yet to offer any new Sonnet, though of praise and prayer to God, to their people (as they call them) by vertue of this gift of the Spirit, doth condemn their boldness in offering every day, new prayers ; whereas there is the very same ground for the one, as the other ; both in Antiquity and the

Apolog. c. 39:

Philo Judæus  
de Vita Contemplat.

Scriptures. *Tertullian* speaks only of singing out of their own heads.\* *St. Paul* speaks as expressly of singing, as praying by the Spirit: yet we hear nothing they have done to declare their spirituality in publick by way of singing, or causing any thing of their own devising to be sung. But surely singing is no less a duty then praying: And if they find it difficult and inconvenient for the people to take the ditty so set by them, from their mouths or hands; and from thence infer that it is not necessary. We reply: That is as necessary, and accordingly was ever practised in Churches, that people should concur with the Priest in prayer too: and therefore such ill-form'd forms as are made and used at the same time, are not fit for solemn service, because though they may be tacitly followed, yet are they so ordered and invented, that the common sort should have no more to do with them than they may with musical prayers and praises, which in heart they may consent to, but in act, can only say, *Amen* to, as is permitted to the people in their extravagant prayers. Would the one be scandalous to those of their Party? so is the other actually offensive to us: and therefore we desire to hear no more of such matters: nor should they expect to find relaxation of Duties from those they are bound in Justice to obey, before they remove such obstacles of communion with them, to those that owe them nothing but charity; and this principally, in reducing them from such a fond admiration of themselves, and gross infatuation of others, by the colour of such false gifts.\*

It would be too long and tedious to take notice here of all their reasons against Set forms; which are of two sorts: the one General against All enjoyned forms; the other, against the English Liturgy in Particular. Of this latter we shall speak least, and not much of the former: because we will take them at their word, when they say, *they are not absolutely against Liturgies prescribed*; though we know they contradict themselves sufficiently. Bishop *Whitgift* hath of old told them home of this their double dealing. For in the Puritans Admonition they directly oppose all forms. *Cartwright* in his Reply to *Whitgift*, endeavouring to bring them off, says, they explain themselves afterward: But they are truly told, that such their Explication is a meer retraction and contradiction, all their arguments formerly being level'd directly against forms in General. And to this day, they are always at that game still, until they be beaten off; and then, forsooth, 'tis only the Liturgies as ill-framed, they complain of: as *Cartwright* hath taught them to dissemble upon occasion, and shuffle. Nevertheless I hold it not amiss to transcribe here a Case of Conscience out of Mr. *Perkins* thus doubting, *Whether it be lawful when we pray, to read a Set form of prayer?* Answer. *It is no sin.* [This is better then nothing.] *But a man may lawfully, and with good conscience do it.* Reasons. *First the Psalms of David were delivered to the Church to be used and read in a Set form of words, and yet the most of them are prayers: Secondly, To conceive a form of prayer, requires gift of memory and knowledge, utterance and the gifts of grace. Now every child of God, though he hath an honest heart, hath not these gifts. And therefore in want of them, may lawfully use a Set form of prayers; as a man that hath a weak back or a lame leg may lean upon a Crutch.* This is the meaning and very expression of the modern Puritan; when he is in the best humour, and would be more generous than ordinary in his concessions. For which we requite him, saying, That it was never lawful, nor is lawful at this day, for any Minister in publick service, to bring in his own conceived prayers, besides the intention of the Church: And, that *Thomas Cartwright*, who, at *Hartford*

*Cartwrights*  
Reply, p. 105.  
*Whitgifts*  
Defens p 488

*Perkins Cases*  
of Conscience,  
l. 2. c. 6.



ford was the first that dar'd to do so to the offense of both the Queen and Church then, did very wickedly; and none that imitated him (though men no enemies otherwise to the Church) did well; unless upon a perswasion of an implicit consent of the Church, through tract of time. But if memory, utterance, knowledge, to which some (that have ridiculously written upon the subject of conceiving prayers, as if they would teach the Spirit how to speak) do adde *Fansie* and *Industry*, be required, how comes this gift to be owing to the Spirit, more than *Demosthenes* his Orations, of whom *Plutarch* writes, what great pains he took with himself to pronounce well, and to compose aright.

But let us hear *Perkins* a little farther, answering an Objection; *It is alledged, that Set forms of Prayer do limit and bind the Holy Ghost.* Answer: *If we had a perfect measure of Grace, it were somewhat, but the Graces of God are weak and small in us. This is no binding of the Holy Ghost, but an helping of the Spirit, which is weak in us, by a Crutch to lean on:* *Perkins ubi supra.* It had been much more reverently spoken if it had been said, *An helping us in whom the Spirit is, than, the weak and lame Spirit in us.* It had been much more soundly answered, to deny the supposition both of the Spirit, and the gift thereof, in men praying extempore; and by consequence clear'd all fears and suspicions of injuring the Spirit at all. Why do they so weakly and lamely take that for granted that the Spirit informs men generally to such ends, and nothing wants a Crutch or Staff to support it more than that? We deny it; we deny it: And wonder how they will go about the making it credible. But we deny the fact, that so it is; and not the possibility, that so it may be: or that the Spirit is able to do such wonderful things. Nay we deny, they are such wonderful things as are pretended; or any more than for a very simple man to become an excellent workman in a curious craft, by applying his wits and labours to the mysteries of it. And seeing they talk so often at this day of Crutches and Stilts, making all creeples and lame in Christianity, who cannot, or out of humility and obedience to the Discipline which justly interdicts such pretended abilities, will not vaunt what they can do; they should do well to procure Stilts and Crutches for such halting and weak reasons as these are, to make men insolent.

Here they are wont to come forth with their ill applied distinction of *Gifts* and *Graces* of prayer: and tell us that the gift of prayer is to be sought after, whereby we edifie the Church, as well as the Grace, whereby we edifie our selves. To which I answer by denying still what they take for granted, *viz.* that such presumed gifts are necessary to the edification of a Church. I grant indeed that the Church was at first settled by gifts, or I should rather have said, founded: but continued and edified to this day so, I deny. I deny as a notorious and pernicious untruth, that such is to be the constitution of Churches, that they should be managed and maintained by the gifts of men, above what by the ordinary industry with Gods blessing may be common to all men. Yet more expressly, I deny that any Society ought to depend upon any thing extraordinary in men, as this gift is cryed up for: For that which carries on the mysteries and majesty of Gods worship, must be grave, sober, regular, safe, and easie; even such, as, they in indignation report, *children, women, and Turks* may perform; and not such as are *high, staggering, uncertain, deceitful*, as are these extraordinary gifts. For this barbarous argument is ill grounded, supposing that it is more the natural, or supernatural parts that qualifie the Ministry, than the power of the Keys given: which if we may suppose given to such persons, we shall de-

clare to be more fit persons to minister in the publick worship of God, than such gifted persons. I say in the worship of God, because there may be much more skill and ability required to the *service* of God: For though preaching and travelling in the conversion of souls to God, be to *serve* God, as an act of obedience unto his will; it is not (as we have often said) the proper *worship* of God, as is prayer: And to *serve* God in this manner being an address unto men, who must be informed with great skill and industry, and then reformed in their lives and conversations, by sedulity of Exhortation, more is necessary than a commission so to act. Moreover, to their distinction of gift of prayer and grace, we add, That we acknowledge no *gift* of prayer besides the *grace* of prayer. There may be a gift of speaking, and that notably, with fluencie and readines, and this is vulgarly mistaken, and admired for a gift of prayer, but it is no such matter. For all the *gift* of prayer, as of prayer, is nothing but the *grace* of prayer, coming from the truly devout and spiritual heart, and not from the operation of the brain, as Elocution doth. And besides, those that have spoken most soberly & truly of gifts, have determin'd the use of them particularly to the Church, and its edification; and not to have God for their proper object: but God is the object of prayer, & therefore it is fully compleated in the grace of it, which in a larger sense is Gods gift too; and is as conspicuous in Set forms, as Extemporary.

But they argue farther in behalf of this manner of prayer, That it is a great edification of the people; much greater than Set forms, which custom hath made ineffectual. To which I answer, That there is a great deal of truth in what they speak, First because, not out of Grace, or the Spirit, but corrupt nature, man is much more apt to be affected with variety, that is inferiour both in kind and use, to constant fare, as with a strange monster, rather than with a well proportion'd creature, to which he hath been accustomed: And he that shall pass by in a fools-coat party-colour'd, shall have more eyes after him, a great many, than he that walks in a much more comely, costly, and grave habit. Men therefore should rather correct their judgments, and mend their hearts, and bring them to conform to sound forms of words, than to please them, in their carnal appetites, after novelties, no new occasions requiring. But this is not all. We except much more against the matter and manner of their prayers, in that they have quite lost and depraved the nature of prayer: For that they give such loose reins unto their tongues generally, that in stead of Confession, Petition, and Thanksgiving, of which prayer ought principally to consist, they fly out into preaching; and jumble and confound those duties so together, that many times in preaching, they mourn and pray: and this is, with the wondering multitude, accounted the best Sermon. They likewise in their prayers fall on preaching, and this is the powerful praying: But they are to consider, that to convert men, is not the office of prayer, but of preaching.

I shall add but one of their Objections more, the rest being easily solved out of the premises. They say, If a prescribed Form or Liturgy had been good or profitable for the Church, Christ, without question, would have delivered one for his Church. To which, on the contrary, I return, If extemporany conceived prayer had been so necessary, as is pretended, surely Christ would some where or other have ordained that we should use extemporany prayers; and conceive that Sacrifice, just as we offer it: But the misery of these Arguers is, that whereas the Scripture commends and commands nothing so much as prayer, not one, the least precept have they been able to find through the whole Scripture requiring prayer extemporany: And then

then is not this an humane invention? Is it not Will-worship? But that Christ hath prescribed a form, and matter of prayer too, we hold it proved out of the two Evangelists. I know well they hold the contrary? What more equal and just way to find out the truth, than to hear both ancient and modern Interpreters upon that doubt, to their dayes. Do they find any that say, the Lords Prayer is so a Rule or Form, that it is not to be the very matter of our prayer too in terms? If not: Is not this another humane invention, hammer'd out of the Crowns of perverse and unskilful men? What would they say if, this very Lords Prayer, as we call it, was by Christ himself drawn from some received forms amongst the Jews, before Christs time? This is affirmed by divers very learned men in Judaical Antiquities. They were set against it enough, and more than enough before, this surely would turn their stomachs worse.

Yet shall we take leave here to recite that sober and most probable Judgment of the *Magdeburgenses* concerning the use of the Lords Prayer. *Without doubt the Apostles propounded the form of prayer delivered by Christ to the Churches, and required all to pray after that manner, although they themselves used other forms of prayers.*

Magdeburgens.  
Centur.  
1. lib. 2. cap. 4.

Much may be said in the defense and confirmation of the received forms of communicating in publick. But what more than what answers the vain cavils against it, which is done? Or the general concurrence of Heathen, Jewish, and Christian practise? all which, where it can be shewed they had any common service, show that it was constantly determined, and of one form; and never changed, but by advice of Authority. Which to prove, because the Affirmative is infinite, we here put in a challenge to give any one instance to the contrary, *viz.* of any one Church, Jewish or Christian, where the publick Service was arbitrary, and left to the private Priest or Minister to form or model as he pleased? He that shall advise with *Gennadius Massiliensis*, shall find, that one solemn point in his dayes for the administration of the publick Worship, was this, *to keep to the solemnities of Sacerdotal Prayers, which from the Apostles were deliver'd to the whole world, and were celebrated in all the Catholick Church uniformly, that there might be an agreement between the Law or Rule of believing and praying.* And where there is a liberty to pray what men list in publick manner, there will soon spring up a liberty to preach what men list, and upon that, for the common sort, to believe what they list; unless that Law of Arms, which themselves have exclaimed against in Religion, keep them in awe.

Gennad. Massil.  
Eccles.  
Dog. cap. 30.

For if we should speak truly and properly, they who have no publick, known, received form of Worship amongst them, can have no Christian Communion one with another; and therefore they desire they know not what, and we should do we know not what, if we should joyn with them. I prove it thus: All Communion properly so called, is in prayer and administration of Sacraments, therefore signally called *the Communion*; and not at all, or least of all, in Faith or Sermons; because a man may believe as much as any Church or Preacher requires of him, and yet be a cursed Schismatick and Alien from the Church. But he that communicates in Prayers and the Sacraments, hath full conjunction with that Body, with which he so communicates. Now farther, to the intent that men may agree in one, they certainly must first know that one thing: For what is Communion, but a common union in One thing, which is a bond so to unite them? But where this is uncertain, moveable, and new as the



the day and hour in which it is produced, how is it possible men should know it, or agree to it? And if nor, How can they be said to enjoy communion in it? Communion is much mistaken if it be look't on as a thing transient, or consisting only in the act, and passing away with it, and ending, and coming again at the returning of the like act: but it is a thing habitual and permanent. So that if we should suppose a man hath heard and approved (for no man, but he that means to be guilty of worse than Popish implicit Faith, can approve a thing meerly future, as *extemporary* prayers are) such prayers, and thereupon freely assented to them: How can this last longer than the very instant of having passed such a sentence? for before he heard them, he could by no means yield rational assent, and after he hath heard them, it can last little longer than the sound doth in his head, for at the next meeting he is as far behind, and to seek as before, and suspends communion. But in forms once heard, judged, and compared with the Rule of Faith and Worship, a man holds constant, real, though not actual Communion exercised, with that Body of which he is a member. And upon common humane probability, may with general devotion joyn with, and in such service of God, though he be out of hearing: especially (which is most easie) being acquainted with the method of the Liturgy and the purport of the several Actions, Postures, and Gestures relating to the several parts thereof. And can these men in conscience require, that we should joyn with them who are so ill set together amongst themselves, as to have nothing more than a blind presumption and credulity that all is, or will be well.

But what should we protract an argument of this nature, any longer against them, who are arrived to such an unnatural height of admiring fresh phrases & inverted numbers of words, when the matter is much the same, that their own uttered conceptions to day, affecting themselves and others wonderfully, and lookt on as spiritual and divine; to morrow, nay on the afternoon, nay next hour, shall be sentenced by themselves and auditors, as an humane invention, and injurious to God and Man? Nay, which is yet more, The form which Christ gave his Disciples, and left to all to be practised, who would be his Disciples, hath met with such hard entertainment amongst these illuminated ones, that 'tis well it escapes a reproach, when it is rehearsed. Tell them here how the ancient and eminent Saints and Servants of Christ did use it in terms, and that daily, and that frequently every day, and that often in the service of the Church in publick, you make the matter worse for them. Tell them how diverse of our own holy Martyrs blessed God for what they saw that day, wherein they were redeemed not only from blind obedience, but worship, & had the comfortable opportunity of worshipping God according to this manner so contemned; they stick a little, and premise some small respect to such good men as would dye against Popery; but for such devout and constant adherence to the Liturgy of the Church, they have no good words for them. But it must be either their unhappiness, that they knew no better, their weakness, they were so fond of that, their want of zeal for a thorow reformation, and of light to see what they did, so clearly as they at this day: And many such pieces of tattle have they in readiness, having neither truth, nor judgment, nor charity in them, but declare plainly they who thus discourse and practise to the contrary, are not of the same Religion with them: as to speak what I hold my self bound to profess, I am not of theirs, who refuse such publick communion with our Church; and hold it utterly unlawful to give so much as ear to them in their will-worship, and especially such as use that way in dislike of & opposition to the established. And so let this end.

CHAP.

## CHAP. IX.

*A third abuse of the Worship of God by Sectaries in neglecting publick Prayers without Sermons, censured. That Prayer in a publick Place appointed for Gods Worship ought at all times to be offered to God. Scripture and Universal Tradition require it above that in private Places. The frivolousness of such Reasons as are used against it. The Reasons for it.*

**W**E come now to take notice of another instance of their injuriousness to the Glory of God, in their vile and low opinion of publick Prayer in Gods House. Whither it should seem they would scarce ever invite Christian people, but for the Sermons sake. And this they may do for their own sakes, because they love to be encouraged (as who doth not) by a full appearance of Auditors. For whoever saw a Sectary at prayers alone in the Church, as was the manner, and ought to be the practise at this day of devout Christians, even upon all occasions to visit Gods house of Prayer, to pour out their hearts before him, to put up the private requests of their soul to God there, as the properest place? I am ashamed to hear, and much more to utter what they have to say against this excellent practise: 'Tis out of one of their Common-places which fights against most of what they approve not amongst us: and there's an end of it. It makes, I am sure, ten times more for the reputation of them whom they bitterly enough hate, then they are aware of. Shall all Jews be not only permitted, but excited to frequent Gods house even at those hours of Prayer in which the publick Sacrifice was not offered? Shall the Apostles of Christ after the Resurrection, as did *Peter* and *John* in exprefs manner, and without all peradventure the rest, who are not expressed, observe the publick place, as well as common time of prayer: Shall our Saviour Christ himself often resort to the Temple, and that of the corrupt Jews, to pray? Nay, shall this end be especially mention'd as to which the Temple was ordained by *Solomon*, that men in private may offer up their Prayers to God? And shall it not become Christians much more? We know not of any publick prayers the Jews had in their Temple at all: but he that shall prove they had any, even at their offering Sacrifice (which I neither positively deny, nor know of, but should gladly learn from others) must, I am confident, prove it a Set form. But every man likely pray'd for himself, as his own heart and occasions moved him, but commonly in a Set form. For when I doubted of prayer in the Temple, it was of any which was common, publick, or general, as with Christians. So that the principal end of Gods house then, next to sacrificing, was that particular men might

Acts 3:1.

1 Kings 8:38;  
39, &c.

John 20. 19.

might come and worship God and pray to him. And to this end the Temple doors were not then only opened, when the Sacrifice was made, and that ended, clap'd to again presently, to shut men out from praying there, at any time of the day. Nay, the doors of the Gentile Temples were not shut up against commers in to worship. And much less they of the ancient Christians, when a publick and peculiar place was appointed for their worship, whatever they were before. If it were so, that in the infant and extreemly persecuted state of the Church, before Christian Religion dar'd to show its face abroad, the doors of places appointed for Gods worship, were shut from the time the service was over, nay, and at the very time of assembling, will they bring us back to that again? We find it indeed to be their Negative use of Antiquity and Prescriptions. That if it cannot be prov'd that such a thing was in use from the first beginning of Christians, they hold themselves sufficiently exempted from the same: but if it can, they will not hold themselves bound to do it: One of their fair dealings. But we think it altogether sufficient, in unquestionable Precedents, to alledge them as imitable and binding, that such were so early and general as could well consist with the safety and advantage of Christianity it self, and its Professours. And this we have, beyond all doubt, to favour and commend to us an open Church, even when there were no publick prayers (though that was daily) and much less a Sermon, which was rarely: and yet God serv'd (I speak modestly) as well, as any where since the Reformation: and free, and frequent access was had to the House of God to pray in. This was continued in all Ages, and all Christian Countries, till some extraordinary Pastours (as they call'd themselves) made the alteration much for the worse, God knows; and would have no man enter the proper place of worship, unless it were to hear the Word, that is, *their word*. This custome (God be thanked) was never quite laid down in our English Church, and I trust in God never will, but gain strength, countenance, and encouragement, knowing that the Mother Churches or Cathedrals, being Precedents to all inferiour Churches pertaining to them, do by their example of daily prayers, and a free access at all convenient times of the day granted for men to pray to God, their private particular prayers, not only approve, but commend to and invite her daughter Churches to the like most godly practise: All Eastern, as well as Western Churches, out of the Precincts of the Reformation (herein very unhappy) set us the like example. And all Churches at first, by great prudence and piety of the founders and promoters were there placed, where they might be most convenient for the Parish to resort to at all times: and also to the best advantage of Roads, that so travellers passing by might have an opportunity to enter them, and do the devotions to God. But now (a thing to be lamented) such a godly custome would be censur'd for superstition; as the Devil, and the Enemies of God never want words to traduce, where they want reason to disprove what is good and commendable. And being born to an error, have a certain horror of leaving it, though no reason can possibly be picked up to retain it. Besides, *Papish* and *Superstitious*, what have any man (I would fain hear) to say against private prayers in Churches? And those tearms are now so bald, and generally so boldly and ignorantly applyed, that they prove nothing more many times than the profaneness of the user; and have done the Church of *Rome* more credit and service, in that many excellent things have been made proper and singular to that Church, which in truth are not, then all the franck language, and most averse practises of such men, have done them discredit or hurt.

But



But it were very strange if they could here find nothing in Scripture to colour their cause, or credit this ungodly opinion. Christ saith (say they, or at least may) *Thou when thou prayest, enter into thy closet, and when thou hast shut thy door, pray to thy father which is in secret, and thy father which is in secret shall reward thee openly.* But do they, who turn these words thus to their purpose, really think that Christ hereby advised men to pray rather at home than in the publick? When I can believe it, I will shew the contrary, and before. For Christ spake not against the *publickness*, but the *hypocrisie* of this prayer. It is not probable indeed, that a man should be so hypocritical in private, as he may in publick: And therefore, to obviate that mortal evil to all divine prayer, our Saviour both confutes and redresses it, shewing it is far better for such, and more acceptable to God, to betake themselves to their closets, where no Man, but God and their own Consciences, can see them, than with such vain ostentation to beg applause of men. And if all the world were such Hypocrites as Christ reprov'd, it were better no man should ever come to Church at any time. But there is the contrary vice to be shun'd, and that is Profaneness. For that is no less, scandalous, yea much more, and must be so accounted. But they, who out of undue reasons refuse the publick place of Gods worship, are to be noted as Prophane.

Matth. 6. 6.

It is most certain, that they who keep to St. Pauls precept in his Epistle to Timothy, *That men pray every where lifting up holy hands, &c.* cannot pray always in one place, especially if we add that other precept of St. Paul, *Pray always*: for no man can be always in that most common place of prayer. And therefore it may be inferred from hence, that it is lawful and acceptable to God to pray privately; but not that prayer in publick is not to be preferred before private. For would it not as well hold against prayer in families, which is not in the closet? And if to every house there were a place dedicated specially to Gods worship, as there is in every parish, I should hold that prayers generally in the family, and particularly of persons singly, were more laudably performed in that publick place, than in a private chamber. But it is further to be noted, That when St. Paul saith, we should *pray every where*, he never intended to equalize all places in fitness to Gods service; he intended not to take off distinction of Christian places to that end, but Judaical, as the Temple of the Jews: which diverse good Christians supposed was to be the special, if not only place, assigned of God for his worship. St. Paul informs them better, & assures them that they should pray every where as well as at Jerusalem: meaning nothing less then that where there were Christian Temples to which they might resort, they should not need go to them, but may keep at home as well, being God is every where, and they must pray every where; but that a place of worship solemniz'd by Christians, was altogether as proper as that Temple of the Jews. Isidore, saith indeed, *Prayer is most opportunely made in private places*, and is more pleasing to God, viz. so qualified as before: A sincere prayer at home is better, many degrees, than an hypocritical one in publick. And the Gloss upon St. Pauls words *with, In every place*, that is, *where ever you are, and not only in the Church.* And the like it saith upon Christs words in St. John to the woman of Samaria, *Thai neither on that mount, nor yet at Jerusalem men should worship God.* But who sees not that it is to be understood signally, and not so superstitiously, as that a Temple might not be as pleasing to God in any other place, as at Jerusalem, or Mount Gerizzim? And I know he addeth, as divers other Fathers, *the Temple of the heart*, which is worthily said, to encourage such persons to inward and chamber-devotion, whose leisure or labours will not suffer them to repair to Church, not to erect an alter in heart & house equal to that in the

1 Tim. 2. 8.  
Ephes. 6.

John 4. 21.

Church. And for my part I see no reason to except unclean places from Gods worship, as some Casuists do, when a more comely and convenient cannot be had? For there is no place unclean in such Cases. But we are now enquiring about the right, a place hath to our Services, other things being equal. As if a man hath as good an heart, as simple intention, as pure charity, as laudable matter petition'd for, whether the place of Gods worship be not it, he ought to offer his Sacrifice in, rather than any other? And whether publick is not required rather than private? And here it may be noted that we make publick prayer of two sorts: Publick in respect of manner, and publick in respect of place: The former, when there is an unanimous and orderly concurrence of many members of Christs Body in one common service. The other, when one single person appears before God in his House, and offers his bounden service and devotion alone. Both these we hold to be better than domestick or private worship of the same nature: and thus prove from reasons not easily to be distinguished, but making for both generally.

First, because the precepts of the Scripture much more often inculcate and more earnestly press this, and more highly magnifie this office than the other. *O worship the Lord in the beauty of holiness*, saith the Psalmist. This *beauty of holiness* was undoubtedly the Temple. And again, *One thing have I desired of the Lord, that will I seek after, that I may dwell in the house of the Lord all the days of my life, to behold the beauty of the Lord, and to enquire in his Temple.* And to what end was the Temple of God built and dedicated so solemnly, but to receive the prayers of devout persons, as well as sacrifices, and the singers in order? Is there any thing more frequently repeated in *Solomons* Oration, than the use of prayer, there especially? And that they who could not enter into the Temple it self, should direct and send their prayers thither? The Jews, it is well known, turn'd to their Temple generally when they pray'd, as *Daniel*; & *Hezekiah* when he was sick, is said to turn his face to the wall, because his house standing with the Temple, he thereby turned his face that way. And I suppose upon this ground, which will be censur'd (I know) as superstitious, that they held opinion their prayers did not immediately ascend unto God, but by entring first into the Temple; which I gather from the prayer of *Jonah*, who being in the belly of the Whale, and the bottom of the Deep, cryed unto the Lord thus, *I am cast out of thy sight, yet I will look again towards thy holy Temple.* Again, *When my soul fainted within me, I remembered the Lord, and my prayer came unto thee, into thy holy Temple.* So that, wherever, or in what condition soever they were, they held themselves obliged to offer their prayers up there first, as the properest place and means to have them ascend unto God: and that

Secondly, because there were greater promises of audience of prayers made there, than in any other place: as it is well known from the prayer of *Solomon*, and the promises of God thereupon, in the Book of the *Kings*.

Thirdly, where there is a greater approbation and consent in the worship of God, there is a greater confirmation of our Faith and Confidence that there we may offer up our prayers to God. But in publick worship rather than private, this is found.

Fourthly, in publick Worship a greater increase of devotion towards God is ordinarily occasion'd at the consideration of the special place of Gods worship, and the special presence God hath promised in that place, in the hearing the prayer, observing the postures and behaviours, of all such as appear before him, and in the dispensation of his graces there. As likewise the eye and example of Men are of very great use and effect to the check-

ing

ing of light, and vain actions which may fall from us, and inviting us to a due veneration of God there, and a decencie to prevent the just censure and offence of others: which was the drift and force of St. Pauls argument to the *Corinthians*, and the case of publick Assemblies of Christians, and their behaviour there; saying, *For this cause ought the woman to have power over her head, because of the Angels*: whether we understand it as doth *Origen* upon *Luke*, *Because the Angels are present in the Church, which deserves so much; to wit, that only which is of Christ; Therefore it is required that women should be covered, because the Angels are there present, assisting the Saints, and rejoycing in the Church.* Or as *Photius* understands it, *That women have power over their head, that is, saith he, have such, who have power over them: and that for the Angels they ought to be covered; who are beholders and witnesses of the production of women, out of man, and proceeding from him.* Or lastly, if we understand the words as some others, who take the *Angels* here to be no other than the Bishop of the Church, or President of the Assembly, of such Christians, for whose sake women ought to cover themselves: because, according to the most ancient form and custom of such Assemblies, the Bishop having a higher seat than the rest of the Congregation, might easily over-look the actions and gestures of all the rest. And 'tis no strange thing for the President or Bishop to be tearmed an Angel: as (what ever *Origen* playing many times with the Scripture, rather than interpreting it, might phantasie) in the Revelation, and in other places of Scripture.

1 Cor. 11. 10.

Origen. Hom  
23. in Luc.Photius Epist.  
Οι ἀποστόλοι καὶ  
μαρτυροῦντες ἐν τῇ  
ἐκείνῃ ἀρχῇ  
γενέσθαι αὐτῆς  
καὶ πατέρα,  
&c.

Rev. 2. 1.

Lastly, The glory of God which (as hath been said) is principally relative, is much more declared and celebrated by the publick than by private worship, even in the sing'e act of one, when occasion is not offered for more, in the publick place of Worship.

But to conclude this, I shall hear give the reasonings of St. *Chrysostome* to this our purpose, upon the occasion of the effect of the joynt prayers of the Faithful in the delivery of St. *Paul* from death, mentioned in his Epistle to the *Corinthians*. If St. *Paul*, saith he, *being in danger, was delivered by the prayer of the multitude, why should not we also expect great benefit from such assistance? For seeing, when we pray singly by our selves, we are weak, but when we are gathered together, we become strong, we more prevail with God by multitude and auxiliaries. For so a King, who often gives one over to death, and yields not to one when he intreats for one condemned; but yields to the importunity of an whole City pleading for him; and upon the importunity of a multitude respites him that is lead to the Dungeon from condemnation, and brings him forth to Life: Such is the force of the supplication of a multitude. For this reason we are here gathered together all of us, that we might more powerfully draw God to commiseration. For seeing (as is said) when we pray by our selves we are weak, by conjunction of Charity we prevail with God to give us those things we crave. But I speak not these things for mine own sake, but that ye may daily hasten to the Assemblies, that ye say not, What is there that I cannot pray for at home? Thou mayest pray indeed, but thy prayer not have the like efficacie, as when it is made with the proper members; as when the entire body of the Church sendeth up its Petition with one consent, with one voice, the Priests being present, and offering up the prayers of the whole multitude. Wouldst thou know of what great force the prayer that is made in the Church is? Peter was bound in Prison, &c.*

2 Cor. 1. 10.  
Chryst. Serm.  
64. p. 662. 663  
Tom. 6.

AAs 12. 5.

And is it not most strange to consider the bold ignorance of the common sort, who dare to turn the words of *Solomon*, and that even in that prayer of Dedication, and signalizing the House of God above all places else, for



Acts 7. 48.  
c. 17. 24.  
1 Kings 8. 27.

Gods worship, against that, and all other Houses to that holy intent, and to make all places alike, when there is nothing so manifest as, that that place was only assigned by God with special injunctions and promises? For when they say, *God doth not dwell in Temples made with hands*, out of the *Acts* of the Apostles: what do they say more than Solomon at the time of dedication, *But will God indeed dwell on the earth? Behold the heaven, and heaven of heavens cannot contain thee, how much less this House which I have built?* Doth not the argument prove that God is no where to be worshipped because he is locally no where contain'd in a place? Or does it prove that he is to be worshipped in private Houses, or contained in them, rather than in the publick? The Gentiles (as St. Pauls words intimate) imagined, that, by certain Images they could bind their Gods to be present, and limit them to certain places, from whence they could not well stir. And this is the reason that some ancient Fathers, as *Arnobius*, and *Minutius Felix* denied, the Christians had any Temples then, meaning such charmed Images and Shrines, to hold God fast to them. The Jews imagined (as appears by St. Stephens words) that Gods promises and blessings were so precisely determined to that One Temple, amongst them, that he would by no means impart himself in like manner, in any other place. To this fond and superstitious conceit, it was very proper to quote their own Prophets against them; who imply what St. Paul expresses elsewhere; *Is he the God of the Jews only? Is he not also of the Gentiles? Yes, of the Gentiles also, &c.* And by vertue hereof, whatsoever the Scripture may seem to ruder readers of it, to speak by way of disesteem of material and visible Temples, implies no more than an equal right of the Gentile Temples dedicated to God under the Gospel, with the Jewish under the Law.

Rom. 3. 29.

Matth. 18. 20.

But that even the publick places of Christians should be looked upon with no greater respect or religion then that which comes next to hand, is no where to be found; and far from being the purpose of Christs words, out of which another exception is made, viz. *Where two or three are gathered together in my Name, there am I in the midst of them.* For what I pray is it to meet in the Name of Christ? Only to take his Name into our mouths? To turn over the Scriptures, and to turn them this way and that way, and profess great matters out of them? By no means. 'Tis true, this is somewhat towards it. But notwithstanding this, men may meet in the name of the Devil rather than of Christ, and do the works of the Devil rather than of Christ. For to do the will and work of either, is to meet in the name of either. And no men who in their very meeting it self, as such are enemies unto Christ, can be said to meet *in the Name of Christ*, speak they never so gracious and glorious things of Christ and Religion. But they who lightly, vainly, and causelessly affect separation, and dismember themselves from the visible, I say, visible Body of Christ, the Society of Saints by Election and Profession, are thereby direct enemies to Christ, and can never meet in Christs Name, according to Christs intention, though, as the worshippers of *Baal*, on *Baal*, they call on Christ, with never so much zeal and earnestness from morning to evening; as we have already shewed where we treated of Schism: And when at length will they, who under such obscure and fond pretences separate, produce any one thing which may countervail the notorioufness of the evil of separation, as a reason to warrant them so to do? But this, either the gross insensateness of the vulgar in such points, or the desperate resolution to hold their own, whatever may be said against them, is little or nothing look't after, till it be too late.

## CHAP. X.

*A fourth corruption of the Worship of God by confining it to an unknown tongue. Scripture and Tradition against that custom. A fifth abuse of Prayer, in denying the People their Suffrage contrary to the ancient practise of the Church.*

**B**UT before we leave this publick worship, we are to observe somewhat of the manner how it ought to be performed, and that to rescue it from two abuses principally crept into it. The first of the Papist, and the other of the Puritan, unluckily falling into the same condemnation with the other. Two things are as evident as Tradition, not to say Scripture, can make any thing; First that all publick and private prayers were instituted in a known tongue. Secondly, that there was a concurrence of the vulgar Christians with the publick Minister of such Offices. Both these are now quite, almost, worn out of use amongst the Romanists, and being disused, a defense framed studiously against the practise of them: The latter hath been practised and maintained by Puritans, though first invented by Papists.

The authority of Scripture for the publick prayers to be made in a known tongue seems to us, and not only to us, but to our more ingenuous adversaries, very express in *St. Pauls* Epistle to the *Corinthians*. The subject of the fourteenth Chapter of the first Epistle is to redress the vanity of certain gifted persons, who presumed to teach and pray in such a foreign tongue, which no man understood but themselves. For whereas it is commonly replied by the Learned Romanists, that the Apostle speaks of preaching chiefly, and not of praying in publick: It matters not much if he doth speak of preaching, as certainly he doth, so it be evident that he speaketh of prayer also, nor that he principally teacheth of prophesying, if he omitteth not publick prayer. Is there any thing need be plainer than this, on our side, *If I pray in an unknown tongue, my spirit prayeth, but my understanding is unfruitful. What is it then? I pray with the Spirit, and I will pray with the understanding also: I will sing with the spirit, I will sing with the understanding also: Else when thou shalt bless with the spirit, how shall he that occupieth the room of the unlearned, say Amen at thy giving of thanks, seeing he understandeth not what thou sayest?* These words are plain enough, one would think, to declare that the Apostle intended publick prayer, as well as preaching or prophesying: Therefore no arts are omitted to obscure and pervert his meaning, but with such ill success, that it is thereby much more illustrated and confirmed to the loss of such corruptors of Scripture, to make it agree with their doctrine and practise. For *Bellarmino* confesses, 'tis very hard to make it good, that the Apostle means only preaching; and so in truth it must needs be, but that there is nothing

1 Cor. 14.

v. 14, 15.

Bellarmino. de  
Verbo D.  
lib. 2. cap. 16.  
to

to necessity, and a willing mind. And therefore to mend the matter, he says, *The Apostle there treateth not of Divine Offices, but of Spiritual Songs, which Christians were wont to compose to praise God and give him thanks.* And what if this were so? For that they had any formed Liturgies in those early unsettled dayes of the Church, while the gifts of the Spirit were so ordinary, I much question, excepting the Lords Prayer, which was ever in publick use, as well as private; if it be not undoubtedly true what is affirmed by no mean Authors, That *St. Peter* celebrated the Mass (taking here Mass in the ancient and innocent signification) with the Lords prayer only; Doth not the argument of the Apostles hold altogether as valid in the ordinary as extraordinary Praises and Service? But when the same Authour can bring scarce any ancients than himself, who are of his opinion, and doth bring *Haymo, Primasius, Lombard, Thomas*, and others, that he means the *Ordinary service*; what worth can there be in such an evasion? Hence it is that another is invented in the same Authour, which acknowledges that there is meant *Common worship*: But that the whole Congregation is not thereby to understand, but only the Clerk of the Parish, who is instead of the unlearned or Idiot to say, *Amen*. For Papists make no doubt but such an one there was who should in such manner answer for the rest of the people. But I make no doubt but they are miserably mistaken. For no records among the Jews, from whom most customs of the ancientest Christians descended, report any such thing: No custom of the primitive Christians warrant this, but the contrary; whatever *Ledesima* the Jesuit saith. For, as shall by and by shewed, the people in general without any such discrimination of persons made their solemn returns unto their Bishop or Priest, who so celebrated in publick. And therefore *Bellarmino* honestly and learnedly rejecteth this interpretation, showing that the phrase of the Apostle which we render, *Supplyeth the place of the unlearned*, comprehendeth no less, *all the vulgar*, then the pretended Clerk. And reason good he should so think, because questionless, by *Unlearned*, is not there meant general ignorance of men, but ignorance of that language which was spoken so extraordinarily: For as *Salmeron* noteth upon the place of *St. Paul*, by *Place* is meant the order of setting in such Assemblies, where the Teachers had one place, and the Hearers, who for that were called *Unlearned*, had another. Hence it is that *Salmeron* would make clearer work: affirming, *That it is not the end of Divine Service that the people should be instructed, but the worshipping of God.* This *Bellarmino* approveth, but betrays his cause in another point; granting that, of old, prayers publick were for the instruction of the people, but now (is not this to own a forsaking of antiquity) the chief use of prayers is not the edification or consolation of the people, but the worship of God. And the Reason which *Bellarmino* gives, is exactly the same which Sectaries amongst us give, to silence the people in publick Devotion, because, *The Minister speaketh not to man, but unto God.* To both which we answer briefly, and against both, *viz.* The Priest speaketh unto God only in prayer, as the proper object, and to the people only in preaching, as the proper object of that: But he also in prayer speaks to the people instrumentally, *i. e.* as to so many instruments or causes concurring to the same end and effect, and therefore ought to understand what is petitioned for, and obliged to concur with the principal Agent, the Minister of God in such worship.

For though we are far from denying what the Papists and Puritans may say, That any prayer is unfruitful or unnecessary which is not understood by the

Salmer. Com.  
in 1 Cor. 14.  
Disp. 30.



the people, in whose behalf it is put up; for it may avail them who are many miles distant, we all grant, and consequently, a prayer not heard, may be useful, as well not understood, when heard: Yet this holds only when inconveniencies or impossibilities obstruct the due exercise of prayer. For as to such, who are deaf and cannot hear, yet come with general reverence to the publick place, and so far, as they can, joyn with the prayers of the Church, I make no question, but considerable benefit to accrew; so such as shall ignorantly, scornfully, or uncharitably neglect to give their general consent and suffrage to the publick communion in prayer, I make no doubt but they bereave themselves of the benefit both of the publick service, and their own private worship. But this cometh not home to the purpose: For of extraordinary acts in Religion, as of particular things in Philosophy, there is no knowledge, and nothing can be determined; but this may, That generally and ordinarily, publick prayers are more prevalent with God when understood and concurred to by publick devotion. And herein doth consist the vulgar error of the Romish Doctors, that they suppose St. Paul should mean (which I confess, as I have said before, our Translation too much favours) that when he saith, *The understanding is unfruitful*, the understanding of the speaker in an unknown tongue; whereas the context will certainly inform us, he meant the understanding of the hearer, who knew nothing of what was so delivered, which some of their own Expositors agree to: as also they do to the great expedience, as well as antiquity, of that custom of the peoples bearing a share in the publick Worship. To demonstrate which, I shall here at large transcribe what I find in sober and learned Cassander. *It were to be wisht, that according to the precept of the Apostle, and the ancient Rite of the Church, that some consideration were had of the people, in the publick prayers of the Church, singings, and lessons which are undertaken for the peoples sake: and that the common sort of Believers should not wholly and constantly be driven from all communion of prayers and divine lessons. St. Pauls words are manifest, that what is said cannot be understood, unless you express it by a tongue signifying your speech: and that he who through ignorance understandeth not what is said, can by no means answer Amen, at the giving of thanks of another. And that Oraculum by notice whereof the Bishop of Rome, with the Senate of Cardinals, granted to the Sclavonian Nation, that they should use the tongue of their Country in sacred actions, seemeth to pertain to all Nations named Christians, Omnis spiritus laudet Dominum & omnis lingua confiteatur ei. Let every spirit praise the Lord, and every tongue confess to him. And Thomas Cajetane, a man doubtless most learned and acute, wrote in a certain place, It were better for the edification of the Church, publick prayers to be said in the vulgar tongue in the Church, which the people may hear, than in the Latin tongue: And when he was for this reproved by some, he answered, He built upon the foundation of the Apostles, in his fourteenth Chapter of his first Epistle to the Corinthians, &c. Thus far, and much more followeth, out of that grave man, to this purpose. So that is one of those things which convince the Church of Rome of Innovation and obstinacie in novelties, as nothing need more be said against it to that end, nothing being said more for it in the upshot of all Disputes, but that for some time it hath been in use there, and the Trentine Convention hath made all sure, according to their manner, by decreeing it inconvenient that Divine Offices should commonly be in the vulgar tongue, as Azorius writeth, and as Salmeron; It anathematizes, such as will not be content with the three tongues in which the superscription was written upon the Cross of Christ.*

Cassand. De-  
fens. Lib. De  
Officio Pii  
Viri, p. 865  
Op.

Azorus Insti-  
tut. Mor. l. 3.  
c. 26.  
Salmer. in 1  
Cor. 16. Disp.  
30.

Which

Which is a fanſie without any firmneſs at all, it being certain no ſuch thing was intended thereby, and evident, that the Hebrew tongue was ſcarce ever uſed in Chriſtian ſervices, though the Syriack hath been. And it is not agreed whether of the two was the Language: but this we reſt not on: nor can the Romaniſts. But when they have turned every ſtone to little purpoſe, they come to that which will never fail them in this or any other point, the determination of *their Church*, and praſiſe of the ſame, which upon no accounts muſt be violated, for that were to looſe or hazard all, as *Azorius* in the place fore-cited doth with little modeſty, and leſs advantage to his cauſe profeſs: and answering this queſtion, *Whether the vulgar tongue might not be indulged to Hereticks petitioning for it, and for the peace of the Church?* ſaith, *I answer, Councils and Fathers and the Church were never wont to yield to ſuch like Hereticks demands.* But this he proves in matters quite of a different nature, as if, when the Fathers would hear of no accommodation with *Arius*, *Eutychens*, *Nestorius* holding notorious hereſies againſt Chriſt (even when they would have introduced ſome verbal agreement) they could be precedents to oppoſe that wherein, if it were falſe, can conſiſt no hereſie; but is true and moſt generally was praſtiſed by all the Fathers and Churches at firſt, and ſo continued for eight hundred years. And therefore he ſpeaks more to this purpoſe in theſe words following: *If it ſhould be granted to Lutherans and Calviniſts, that they ſhould celebrate Divine Service in their vulgar tongue, they would afterward give out that they had got their wills: yea, that the Church had changed her opinion, and left off her ancient cuſtom, as contrary to Scripture, and ſo charge the Church with erring: and would exult with incredible joy and gladneſs over it, &c.* This is in truth the very ſame reaſon which our grave Puritans render, why they conform not to the Church in her Service, whenas they confeſs they have nothing of ſin to object againſt the thing it ſelf, *viz.* They ſhould be judged of mutability and levity, & ſhould thereby weaken their Miniſtry in the eſteem of their people: which in all probability they borrowed from their Father *Calvin*, one of whoſe reaſons againſt the moderation of *Melancthon* was, that if they ſhould make any correſtion in that Reformation, which was ſo haſtily huddled up, they ſhould weaken their Miniſtry. The reaſonableneſs of which I leave to others to judge of.

Calvin. Epiſt.

But rejecting the common reaſons (all of which we are not here to examine) of Papiſts, we ſhall freely oblige them to give better grounds of the Liturgies in unknown tongues, than may be ordinarily found amongſt them, though no ſufficient can be given. And one is the great veneration had to the traditions of the Ancients in worſhipping God: not that anciently any inſtance can be given, that may be a precedent to the corruptions of theſe times, but that having, with ſober, grave, and holy advice, framed a Liturgy in any one tongue, they were very ſcrupulous how they made any alteration therein, though of words only; and therefore that which is vulgarly ſpoken, altering daily, and that which was written remaining altogether unchanged in words, traſt of time bred a diverſity between the one and the other. But this we demand of our Adverſaries, what one preſident for many hundred years together they can produce, where, at the firſt inſtitution of publick Service, it was ſo contriv'd that nothing of the vulgar language ſhould be taken into it? There is a vaſt difference between a paſſive and an active and purpoſed inconvenience. The ancient predeceſſours of the Roman Church never intended that their Latin Service ſhould be hid or unknown from the common people, which many generations after followed; yet ſo it muſt needs fall out in time. But they, who at this day plant Churches in both

*Indies,*

*Indies*, and obtrude their Latine tongue upon the people there; and who deny liberty to other Provincial Churches in Europe, and elsewhere, to celebrate in their known Language, do purpose mischief unto such Christians, and become Schismatical, in not only not redressing themselves according to the Rule of their fore-fathers, whom they should much more imitate in ordering their service, so that the Common Christian might understand the same, as primitively and for a long time they did; than in sticking so severely to the bare Letters and Syllables they used: not making conscience of far more scandalous practices, in altering the service it self in matter, by absurd additions and detractions: but with denunciation of Excommunication against such Churches as shall presume to redress that evil of ignorance, and render Christians intelligent of what they do.

But I have been of opinion, that the vulgar have been no small cause of this great superstition and inconvenience to themselves: In that, in process of time, their devotion slackning in timely repairing to the Church, and in due demeanor in the Church; neglecting to concur with the Minister of God, and to reciprocate with him, and almost deserting the Service by coldness, sloth, and indevotion; the Priest was constrained (perhaps with a Deacon or Clerk only) to perform the service alone. And truly, let such people look to their modern teachers, who have instilled such ungracious opinions into them, as to take them off from an hearty and diligent answer and reply to the Minister; and thank themselves, if ever they be denied the understanding the publique worship of God. For is there not much reason that the service should forsake them, who forsake that? And that they who will not concern themselves reverently and devoutly, as they ought to do, in it; should be made incapable of so doing, by such an invention as this?

I know they of the Sectaries (as their writings testify) can be content the Common people should say *Amen*, at the last: as if *St. Paul* had indeed intended no more than that one word: whereas, in all probability, he intended not that word at all, in terms; but such a constant and general suffrage as might be implied in that word; and yet that word very laudably used in the conclusion of several prayers. It may (I should think) put them to the blush, to consider how, herein, they vary from the whole practice of ancient Churches; as I could particularly show, and give us no reason why they presume so sacrilegiously to defraud the People. I have, I confess, met in some of their writings, such an one as can scarce be wondred at enough, coming from them. For they say, it may give some occasion to the Laity to invade the Office of the Minister, (Priest they would have said, if they dur'd) to speak so in Publique. And is not this wonderful and ridiculous both, that they, who have by their own Principles, quite destroyed the ancient Hierarchy of the Church, so far as power would enable them; and by their practice, opened a way for all comers into the Ministry, by defending *Extraordinariness* of Vocation, should be more zealous than any Hierarchical persons in either Ancient or Modern days, for the Dues and Rights of the Ministry? This surely can have no good meaning, as it hath no good reason: seeing all that the Laity doth in such cases, is only to follow, and not to lead, as Pastours do; and to answer the call of others, and not to give any law, or word to any. Is there any fear that the common people should ascend to the throne, when they give their approbation by shout and applause to the Oration of their King made from thence? Thereciprocation of the people was never looked upon other-

Account of  
the Conference at, &c.



Consecrat.  
Dist. 1.

Joseph. Vice-  
com. Observ.  
Eccl. Tom. 3.  
l. 1. c. 14.

wife, than a sutirage, and an instance, and argument of the inward affection born by them to the worship of God, performed by the Priest, and a proof of their communion with him. So that very early in the Church it was constituted, that no such publick service should be performed in the Church, where there were not two at least, to make answer to the Priest. And as there was never before these prevaricating Sectaries, any fear that the Deacon should invade the Priests office, because he made answer to him; so neither, that the people should usurp either, because they replied to both, as innumerable instances may prove: take this amongst many which I could add to them already collected by *Viccomes*. In the Æthiopian Mass, which bears the name of the Universal Canon, thus speaks the Deacon, '*Bow the knee. People. Before thee, O Lord, we bow it, and praise thee.* The Assistant to the Priest saith as followeth, *Lord, Lord, &c.* The People replies the same. Then the Assistant of the Priest (or rather Bishop, for so the word *Sacerdos* and ἱερεύς properly used, signifies) follow the Prayer, *Lord, &c.* The Deacon says, '*Arise to Prayer.* The People, *Lord have mercy upon us, &c.* Thus and much more anciently. Now for the credit of the Roman Church, and much more for the Puritan, who agrees with it herein, hear what follows in *Viccomes*. *This custom is long since antiquitated in the Latin Church, a custom being brought in, that some one of the number of Clerks should answer to the Priest in the sacred ministration of the Mass. Which when it first began may well be doubted, by reason of the scarcity of Writers who treat of it. But if I may use my conjecture, it was but a little before Beroaldus his dayes [which Beroaldus I take to be him who lived about the year 1480] because he is the first that I can find who makes mention thereof in a Manuscript of Ceremonies, which is extant in the Library of the Canons of the great Church, &c.* By which it may be seen which are most popish, the Church of England in its publick Liturgy, commending and prescribing this ancient custom and laudable; or Sectaries, who have conspired with Papists to abolish it, and exclude it out of their Service.

## CHAP. XI.

*Of the Circumstances of Divine Worship, and first of the proper Place of Divine Worship, called the Church, the manner of worshipping there. Of the Dedication of Churches to God: their Consecration, and the Effects of the same. That no man can convert any part of the Church to his private use without profanation of it and Sacrilege. Against the abuse of Churches in the Burial of dead Bodies, erecting Tombs; and enclosing them in Churches or Chancels. Rich men have no more right to any part of the Church than the Poor. The Common Law can give no Right in such Cases.*

**T**HERE are two very considerable circumstances in most Moral and Divine Actions, *Place* and *Time*, which have great influence upon the goodness and evil of an action. And we have already so far touched the former, as to assert the Excellencie of a Place Publick above the Private Closet, or Domestick Rooms. Now it is requisite we should enquire into the condition of such publick places, as we call *Temples* or *Churches*, omitting here the various names and significations and acceptations, as more proper for larger and learned Treatises. And yet we must not omit the distinction of Church, into Proper and Improper, as *Austin* doth thus use it. For so (saith he) we call the Temple [*Basilica*] the Church, wherein is contained the people, which are truly called the Church; as that by the name Church, that is, the people contained in the Church, we should signifie the place which contains, &c. And to prevent all mistakes, we confess we here mean that opprobriously called, *The Steeple-house*, as no bodies house; but, as we believe, the *House of God* by institution and designation: however it proves many times by Hereticks and Schismatics intrusion and usurpation, the House of the Enemy to God: But the Kings Palace is still the Kings, though Rebels and Usurpers possess themselves by violence and injustice of the same.

And that certain Houses may become the houses of God, in a peculiar manner, no less than Houses and Lands may be the rights of Man, will appear from the very same grounds, which are generally three, *Donation, Purchase, Occupation*. *Donation* is the Transferring of the Right of one Man to another, under which we reduce *Inheritance*: which though now custom of Law has made to descend to the next heir, without any act of the prede-

*Sic ergo appellamus Ecclesiam Basilicam quia continetur populus, &c.*  
Aug. Ep. 157.

The place is called Gods Temple or Church, because the company and congregation of Gods people (which is properly called the Church) doth there assemble themselves, on the days appointed. *Homil. Ch. of Engl. Of the Place, &c.*  
p. 126.

cessour, yet originally it was constantly by gift: and the Law supposes now a gift of the deceased, where no formal donation is mentioned to him that is to succeed, nor any other. Purchase is the transferring of the Right or Dominion one hath of any thing to another, upon civil contract and consideration; whereas the other seemed rather to be natural. Occupation is the possession of a thing free from any proprietary, and retaining the same unto his own proper use. All these ways, both Houses and Lands may be transferred unto God, upon this farther supposition, that to the acquiring of a Right of Dominion, the act of the person to whom it is transferred, is not immediately necessary, but another in his name and right may assume it. So that if any entering into uninhabited and unpossessed Countries, to which no man layeth a claim, shall take up such a quantity of ground in Gods name, and declare it devoted to the use of Religion and the Service of God, it as undoubtedly becomes the possessions of God, as it would have belonged to himself, had he retained to himself the right of the first *Occupant*, as they call it. Again, when out of the revenues of such sacred Estate, commonly called *Church-Lands* or *Means*, there is purchase made to the same end, and in the same nature. But most known is that of Free *Donation*, either of one or more to the Service and Honour of God, which we call *Dedication*. Which *Dedication* is an outward act or ceremony signifying the *Alienation* of the right formerly posited in others, and *Translation* thereof to Gods Service: which because, God conversing not with us Civilly, as we do one with another, it cannot be put immediately into the hands of God, is taken up in Gods name for his use, by his more immediate Servants: and by consequence, is not to be wrested from him, nor alienated to any prophane, I mean common humane uses; any more than is that which in right belongs unto one man, to be granted to, or usurped by another, without concession or consent in some manner implied, if not expressed.

This ancient Rite of Dedicating Churches was at first very agreeable to the simplicity of Christian Religion it self; yet like all passing of Estates from one to another in the more natural and rude condition of Humane Society, where there was alwayes a change of the Propriety, where was any propriety at all; but very simple and rude without any formalities as are now in use in those called civilized Countries, but with no less validity. And so it was at first in the alienation of Houses from humane Proprietaries, and devoting them to God. For as *Baronius* hath observed, As the Kings or Emperours Exchequer was wont at first to lay claim to any thing by casting over it the Emperours Mantle, or putting his Image or Name upon it, even so the Bishops were wont to consecrate Churches to God, no otherwise than by marking them with the *Title* of the Cross, or with its Banner. Whence it was that the Emperour *Theodosius*, *Leg. ult. de Paganis Cod. Theod.* commanded that the Temples of the Gentiles should serve for Christian Religion, by placing upon them the sign of the *Venerable Cross*. Hence is that of *Perkins* concerning this matter, who saith, *The ancient Consecration of Churches was with meer words and prayers, not with crossings, or such like rites: And dedication of Churches began about the year 300 after Christ*, is partly found true, and partly erroneous. For *Funcius* yields much more, confessing that *Hyginus* Bishop of Rome ordained that Temples should be dedicated to God with solemn Rites and Ceremonies, which was about the year 141. And yet it is true what *Perkins* saith, that very simple was the first form.

But we do not so much here enquire into the Antiquity or Form of Consecration, as the reasonableness and effect of such consecration. And the reasonableness

Baron. Ann.  
112. num. 45,  
46

Perkins De-  
monst. Pro-  
blem.

Funcius Com-  
ment. l. 2. ad  
Ann. 141.



sonableness doth appear from the common grounds already laid, and the necessity of some outward visible form to be used in such Dedications, as well to manifest to the world the renunciation of propriety, in any that may otherwise pretend to reserve their right to themselves, anciently enjoyed, as also to declare to what end, and upon what conditions they so part with that right, and to whom it thenceforward belongs: all which, if it must be traduced with the opprobrious name of *Superstition*, & so pass as invalid or sinful, I would pray such enemies, as he did those that desired Aristocratical Government, to settle it first in their own Families, and then as experience should prompt to them, to commend it to the Publick: First, to take up estates upon such simple, unceremonial acts, themselves; and as they find the event, to offer that as the most simple and sober way for Gods House to pass from others hands into Gods: I know the haters of *Superstition*, to far greater superstition, are wont to say, It suffices that such is the consent of Christians, that a place should be allotted in convenient manner to Gods Service, and that it is sufficiently consecrated (if they dare speak such a bold word) by *concomitancie*, that is, when such acts of Divine worship, as their prayers, and specially preaching, are there exercised: But this will no ways be accepted, both because they do the same duties in places which they hold no wayes thereby alienated from their common uses. And this is no more than for a man to lend another his house to keep a Feast in it; and not so much as if a man should let out his house for one to keep his Shevalry or Majoralty in. But that we require is, that a place should so be made over to Gods use, that it should be out of all mens power justly to reduce it to humane propriety and uses: And this can only be done, and is done by such acts of publick Dedication as we plead for, and never could hear half a note of sense, reason, or religion against it; though we hear too great and unchristian clamours to the contrary, with wonted revilings.

Supposing then this, we pass to the effect of such Dedications unto Almighty God, one of which is contained and expressed in the formal abrenunciation made of all Civil Right to such a place; and by consequence, for any man to convert any part of it to his own use, is sacrilegiously to prophane the same. A thing, which I take this occasion to note against the gross abuse of Churches, by the Greater sort; who commonly by building themselves large and stately Pews, and inclosing what is every poor Christians Freehold, as well as the richest and noblest of the parish, make it more sacred to the common Christian than any other part of the Church besides. For that must be kept under lock and key; and if not, yet the greatness and power of the person who hath laid that out for himself, suffices to deter any ordinary man from making the like use of that, as of any other part of the Church, lest his secular hand lye heavier upon him, than the Ecclesiastical power can, or must upon him, for such invasion of every parishioners right as well as his; So that what it is not lawful for, or just to do to the *Common* for beasts, or *Town-Green* where he lives, he makes no scruple at all to do to Gods *Peculiar*, and the *Common* to Christians: As if so be Churches now-a-dayes were of the same nature with new found and possessed Lands in the *Indies*; every man may have what he can enclose and fence in for himself and his friends only. Whereas this should be well understood by every good Christian that hath the fear of God, as a Christian ought, before his eyes, that the poorest person that takes collection in the parish, hath as much reason and right to erect places in the Church to themselves, and to possess themselves of any part of it, as the rich, but that  
it

*Id possumus,  
quod jure pos-  
sumus.*

it is not so much in his power. And doth any man think he hath a good *Right*, because he *can* do it? *That we can do* (saith the Law) *which we can lawfully do*. But that we can lawfully do, which the Common Law doth not interdict alwayes. For the Common Law (whether because it concerns altogether men in their civil capacities and proprieties, such as this is not; or whether it hath not heretofore been such a Dragg to enclose all it could lay hold on, without consideration of other Courts Ecclesiastical, which were alwayes received in all Christian Commonwealths, but left many things to the decision of the more peculiar Laws made in behalf of Churches, and Ecclesiastical Cases) hath made no provision at all for the securing of the Rights of the Church, or Christians thereunto belonging, I mean in their Capacities properly Ecclesiastical: so that scarce any remedy can be obtain'd from thence, if a man shall steal any thing off the very body of the Church it self. And can any man that hath any sense of Religion take sanctuary or protection from that, in defense of his violation of Christians Rights, and think all well done that is not punishable by that Law, and lawful that it doth not interdict? For by the same reason a man may inclose to himself a third part or more of the Church. But they will modestly say, that were unreasonable: and I will boldly say so is the other; and especially where, when the Authours of such Fabricks, making no use of them themselves, shall deny the use of them to others, case so requiring. But that which is yet more intolerable, is, That the power and purse of the Great man (who is alwayes to remember that the poorest man in the parish hath as much Law and Right on his side to shut him out, as he hath to exclude and over-top the poor in his building) should enable and embolden him so far as to take a considerable part of Gods sanctuary, and inclose that from all use and access, to lay the bones of his Family in, and wholly to alienate it from all Divine Services, and dedicate it only to corruption, and with impudent Sacrilege to erect many Monuments and Tombs in a Canton they have usurped to themselves: which being, as is said, no less lawful for any man than for one man, instead of Christians, in time, we should have a Church filled with Sepulchres of the dead. And when this is once done, to endeavour a redress of such sacrilegious invasions of Gods and good Christians Rights, is to expose Gods servants to, not only the obloquy, power, and mischief of too potent an Adversary, but to the damage of Common Law; which though it can give no right so to do, yet will certainly defend the wrong-doer, if he can plead custom. But I have often thought, that God in this last Age hath done himself Justice against such Families, as have been guilty of such prophane usurpations, in that he hath stirred up a barbarous Sect of Christians of late, and let them justly into Churches, like *Goths* and *Vandals*, to break to pieces, pull down, and raze the scandalous monuments of many Churches erected to the honour of Man, and dishonour of God.

Plutarch. in  
vita Lycurg.  
Eutropius  
Lib. 8.  
Cicero de  
Legibus, l. 2.

At first, all dead Bodies were lookt upon by the Heathens themselves as unclean, and unworthy to be buried within the walls of their City. *Lycurgus* was the first that suffered Corps to be interr'd in the City, and that near the Temples in *Lacedemon*, saith *Plutarch*. The first of all Roman Emperours (and much more of the inferiour people) that was buried within the City, was *Trajane* the Emperour; which was prohibited by a Law of the twelve Tables, as *Cicero* witnesseth. And *St. Vedastus* was wont to say, That the dead should not be buried within the walls of a City, which was a place for the living, and not for the dead; as *Alcuinus* in his life writes.

And

And it is certain, no Christians at all were buried in Churches for many hundred years, but certain proper Cemeteries or Dormitories were allotted for that purpose, remote from Churches. Pope *Nicholas* the first, about the year 867, was thought to be preferred to be buried before the Church doors of *St. Peter*, saith *Naclerus*. And the same *Naclerus* writeth, how that about the year 983, *Otho* the third Emperour was buried at the Threshold of *St. Peter* at *Rome*. And when they had brought dead bodies to the Church door, they soon presumed to bring them in; and found a reason so to do: because the bodies of true Believers, and holy Servants of God were not to be looked on, as unclean or unworthy of so sacred a place, because they had been themselves Temples of the Holy Ghost, and were to be reunited again to their blessed spirits in heaven. And not only so, but the nearer the Altar, always the better: mistaking that place in the *Apocalypse*, I saw under the Altar the souls of them that were slain for the word of God, and for the testimony which they held; collecting from hence, that for Martyrs and holy persons that was the properest place to be buried in. And the Canon Law, surely misguided by such a vain perswasion, hath decreed it necessary to the Consecration of a Church, that there be the body, or at least some Relique of a Saint there posited. But more reasonably doth it erre, when it affirmeth that it is *Desecrated* by the interrment of Hereticks there. But certainly the words in the *Revelation* expressing a Vision, meant no such thing as they are alledged for, but only that in that Vision, the holy Apostle beheld the souls of Saints and Martyrs departed, humbled before, or at the foot of the Altar (as the manner was anciently to pray especially at the time of offering) crying aloud, and with great importunity, for justice and revenge upon the Persecutors of the Church, and Murderers of them for the Testimony of Christ Jesus. Naclerus  
Vol. 3. p. 64.  
ibid. p. 94.  
Rev. 6.9.

But because such hath been, and I fear ever will be, the corruption of Christian Religion, that he that hath power in his hands, and money good store in his purse, shall be Sainted, so far as outward ceremonies and privileges can advance him, he that would be at the charge of breaking up of the ground, hath not been denied, nor dare any that I know (whatever they ought to do) deny him the liberty of being buried in the Church. This may be, and must be passed over, but the affectation or irreligious ambition of building stately Seats, and making that which is common to all Christians, peculiar to some house, so as upon no occasion it must be used by others, is wicked and sacrilegious: and much more the taking in of any the least part of Gods ground, as the Church is, to the prophane uses of making Tombs and Sepulchres, and no other. They are wont to say, There is room enough besides. It may be so: for they commonly who thus enclose or usurp Gods Land, have thin'd the inhabitants of the place where they live, by illegal enclosures of the Common belonging to the Parish, and so almost dispeopled the place. But what is that to them, more than any body else? And why may not any man, upon the same reason, violently or fraudulently take away certain Acres of Land from him, and say in his defense, He hath left him enough still? And least such as are Patrons of Churches, and have certain supposed Prerogatives over the Chancels, above what can be pretended to by the common sort of people, should conceive they may there do as they please; they are to know, That in right and conscience such fore-mention'd practises can least of all be done. For as the Founder of the Church, so likewise the Builders of Chancels (from whence only they can pretend such privilege) and as the maintainers of it in repair, do at the time of the consecration v. 10.



consecration consent to a total alienation of all civil propriety from themselves; they can neither build, nor bury there, nor incommode the place, more than any other man, for they are only Guardians, and not Owners of that place; upon which they may, and ought to exclude and refuse all such incommutations of others, as may any way deface, or straiten, or empair the same, but they have no more right to do any such things there themselves, then he that is Trustee or Guardian to an Orphan, to seize upon his estate, or any part thereof to his own use. And it is only civil custom, which hath given him a peculiar right of burial there, rather than any body else. And this may seem sufficient, if not too much, to have said of the Negative force of Dedication of Churches, against Usurpers of Gods and Christians Rights.

Acts 13. 27.

The positive effect, which is a veneration and worship therein of God Almighty, doth farther confirm this, and is contained in the end expressed, as well as in the form of Dedication used by *Solomon*, as the constant practise of the Jews, whose Tabernacle or Temple had nothing of constant preaching or instruction of the people, but only Prayers and Sacrifices. Afterward their Synagogues (called also *Proseuche*) for convenience, because all people could not meet at the Temple, were erected: where, as the Scripture tells us, the Law was read, and *Moses* preached every Sabbath day: but they had their special denomination from the Office and Acts of Prayer; *Synagogue* signifying no more than an Assembly in general. From whence (if not also from the consent of all Nations besides, who had Temples to their Gods) it may appear that the most principal end of Gods House was always (till an ignorant irregular Generation sprang up) esteemed the House of Prayer, and Worship; and teaching and instruction of people, very necessary indeed, as the foundation upon which all worship must be built, was not that main end, as is pretended. And this worship being in its proper place in the Church; was always, and ought to be performed in most publique manner, and most solemn, as to outward appearance, as well as inward affection; to which too many deluded by a gross and cheap piece of Sophistry, would confine Gods worship.

It is true, we have no direct precept in the New Testament, that I can call to mind, enjoying any particular behaviour at the time of Gods service; nor yet in the Law. And why so? were not that very necessary, in case any outward carriage were necessary: Yes truly; if so be such a Religious manner of worship could be known to us no other way than by Revelation extraordinary. For Gods word is very sparing in those things of which we may, by the common light of Nature attain to the knowledge. For who is there that knows there is a God, that knoweth not also, that he is to be worshipped? Who is there, that knoweth that God is to be worshipped, that knoweth not also that he is to be worshipped in the most lowly and reverent manner? And that reverence outward is mutable, and various, according to the opinion of several Countries: and therefore no one general Rule could be made comprehending and obliging all people: but this is laid down to us, that what is accounted in any Nation, most solemn, humble, and reverent, is that which is required of us in the worship of God. But surely kneeling, bowing the body, uncovering the head, yea and prostration of the body in convenient time and place, are acts of worship, such as were in use among the Jews of old, continued by the Apostles and successors in Faith and Devotion, as innumerable places of Holy Writ, in the Old and New Testament, intimate unto us: where

*falling*

falling low at Gods footstool, bowing the knee, and such like outward acts of reverence are put for prayer it self: which they never would have been, had not they been the known manner of worship. And *Salvian* describes to us the custom of Christians in his early days, thus. *We presently haste to the Lords house, we cast our bodies on the floor, and pray with weeping and joy mixt together.* And I am not advis'd of more then one place which interdicts any one piece of irreverence as unnatural, and that the superstition of Puritans hath cast them into; and that is, *covering of mens faces* in the time of publique prayer, when the hat, as an instance of devotion must be held before the eyes, as if they were asham'd of what they did: whereas *St. Paul* saith plainly, *every man praying, or prophesying, having his head covered dishonoureth his head*; and again. *For a man ought not to cover his head, &c.* But surely he who covereth his face with his hat, or such like, doth altogether as much thwart the design of the Apostle, as he that covereth it with his hair. I wonder much, who could be the author of such an indecent and absurd custom; but more to find it defended in some sort by *Calvin* upon *Esay*; and reasons rendered for the same, by *Amesius* in his Cases of Conscience: the best he can devise, being these two, *Either to prevent avocation of mind, which may be occasioned by the eye: Or to conceal such singular gestures, which may be some times necessary to us, but seem silly and hypocritical to others. These two occasions being taken away, Covering the head agrees rather to women than men,* 1 Cor. 11. 4, 5. Thus he. And that these are not sufficient causes, thus appears: because such an accidental inconvenience, as is the former, ought not to null a direct good: but publique and open profession of our duty, reverence and devotion to God, is that which God doth require, as an act of worship; and the good example to others should preponderate that particular possible inconvenience. And as for the other; no man ought to use such absurd and ridiculous ceremonies in his face, being in publique, as should be apt to give offence, but compose his whole man to such gravity and decency, as might become the place wherein he is; which is in every mans power, as it is his part. And 'tis very unreasonable, and somewhat more, that men should abhor to receive ceremonies of Communion and uniformity from the Church, and yet be more superstitious in inventing, and introducing private Ceremonies into the Church, and unapproved by it: such as this is. But though all postures and gestures be alike in nature; yet nothing must be done in publique, but what is reputed sober, modest, and grave; as well in respect of the persons assembled, as for the place sake: of which, if we had a due opinion, it would be superfluous to multiply arguments to extort reverence therein.

And what need we any farther proofs of the dignity of it, then that it is Gods house, as hath been shewed, and the place where his honour dwells, and our happiness especially. And therefore, before I end this, I cannot forbear giving all good Christians warning of one of Mr. *Perkins* absurd and false dogmes, which I doubt not, but hath deceived many into prophaneity in publique. *In regard of Conscience, Holiness, and Religion, all places are holy and alike in the New Testament, since the coming of Christ: The House or the Field, is as holy as the Church: And if we pray in either of them, our prayer is as acceptable to God, as that which is made in the Church.* All this we look upon as prophane and false: Let us hear how, out of Scripture, he proves his new paradoxes. *For now (saith he) the days are come which were foretold by the Prophet, where in a clean offering should be offered to God*

*Salvian. de Provid. lib. 7. Ad domos statim dominicas currimus, &c.*

1 Cor. 11. 4.

7.

*Calvinus in Esaiam cap. 38. 2.*

*Ames. de Conscient. lib. 4. c. 18. quest. 3.*

*Perkins Cases of Conscience lib. 2. c. 6. qu. 3. §. 3.*

in every place, Mal. 1. 11. which *Paul* expounds 1 Tim. 2. 8. of pure and holy prayer offered to God in every place. Of these words of St. *Paul* (which I acknowledge to be the sense of the Prophet) I have already given the true meaning, and so answered both to this effect: That whatever the Scripture prophetically delivers concerning the diffusion of Gods worship, or the Apostle actually declares as come to pass, comes to no more but that, God should be more purely served under the Gospel by the Sacrifice of prayer, &c. than he was by the Sacrifice of beasts to him, and such like: and that the service of God should be as well performed out of *Jerusalem*, as in it: and in Christian Temples, in what Country or Angle of the world soever they were built, as in that of *Hierusalem*: but that it was ever intended, that he should be as well served in the fields or private houses, as in Churches raised for that purpose (when necessity constrained not men otherwise) doth not in the least appear. And the same answer likewise we give to the words of Christ to the woman of *Samaria*, *Joh. 4. 25.* of which we also spake before: As also to that of Christ, *Matth. 6. 5.* reproving the affected hypocritical practise of the Pharisees, praying in all publick places, to be noted: Then which kind of Devotion no doubt but a Prayer in the Closet is much more acceptable to God. But doth it therefore follow, that such a prayer as is so acceptable in the closet, would not be as acceptable in the Temple, and more too? surely nothing of this, which ought to be the conclusion, is contained in the argument.

Now (proceeds Mr. *Perkins*) the opinion of the Papist is otherwise. (It is so, and is much truer than the Puritans, and more agreeable to the word of God) For he thinks, that in the New Testament, hallowed Churches are more holy than other places are, or can be; and do make the prayers offered to God in them, more acceptable to him than in any other: and hereupon they teach, that private men must pray in Churches, and private prayers must be made in Churches, if they will have them heard. All this they teach indeed, but do they teach this as Papists or as Christians? Did not the doctrine and constant practise of all ages and places, when, and where there were Churches, teach the very same? Nay doth not *Bucer* one of the most eminent Reformers for judgment and learning say in a manner as much in these words. With what religiousness therefore are places consecrated to Divine worship to be opened to this one thing, and to be preserved most sacred, we have in some measure before shewed. But vulgar custom has far prevailed in a horrible profanation of these places, while men having thrown away all reverence of a Deity in them, walk in them for their recreation, as in walks void of all sacredness, and in them exchange all sorts of prophane and impure discourse; so that to remove this so unseasonable dammage to the Divine Majesty, severe Laws of godly Kings and Princes are requisite, and ready and constant vindications of such Laws; besides the devout exhortations of holy men: whereby it should be brought to pass, that Gods holy Temple should not be exposed to any other actions, than for which they were consecrated, nor should any go unpunished who in them shall not accommodate himself altogether to such sacred religiousnesses. And must that odious name of *Papist* render such excellent acts and customs odious, as all the Christian world, for many hundred years before Popery prevailed, frequented, be blasted with the slander of Popery, and no more objected against it, but they defend and practise it? Away with such fond (to speak more moderately than the case requires) inferences, out of Christians & sober mens mouths. It is no better than profaneness, all this.

For proof hereof (saith *Perkins*) they alledge the practise of some particular persons

Quanta jam religione sunt & loca cultui Dei consecrata, huic uni respate faciendus, supra aliquam ex parte ostendimus. Adeo autem vulgo obtinuit horum locorum horrendo sane profanatio, &c. *Bucerus* de Regno Christi, l. 2. c. 11.



persons in Scriptures, (which is much more then can be alleged against the practise) Of Anna, who prayed privately in the Temple, Luke 2. 37. Of David, who in his exile desired greatly to have recourse unto the Temple: And of Daniel, who is said to look out of the window towards the Temple, and pray, Dan. 6. 10. Of these likewise we have spoken above, and shown in what sense they oblige to imitation. For that the Temple of Jerusalem, and the prayers and worshippers in it may be in some case Presidents to us, *Bertram* himself, a *Genevan*, doth grant, drawing a determinate place for Gods worship in peculiar manner, from the dayes of *Adam* himself, and not only from *Solomons* Temple, writing thus: It is manifest that a place is due in peculiar manner to Divine worship. And some of the ancient Expositours of the Jews, do not unfitly draw from Gen. 4. 3, 4. that the Sacrifices of Cain and *Abel* were brought to *Adam*, for there was a place to that purpose, &c. But let us hear how *Perkins* comes off from the allegations of Papists, as he calls them, to the advantage of his Cause. These places (saith he) are abused by the Popish Church: For there is a great difference between the Temple of Jerusalem in the Old Testament, and our Churches in the New: That was built by particular commandment from God; so were not our Churches. That was a type of the very body and Manhood of Christ, Heb. 9. 11. and of his mystical body. Again, the Ark in the Temple was a pledge and signification of the Covenant, a sign of Gods Presence, a pledge of his mercy, and that by his own appointment: for it was his will there to answer his people: but the like cannot be shewed of our Churches or Chappels. And whither tends all this, so much as to shew that the Jews Religion was a better Religion than the Christian? For surely, that Religion which hath God nearest, and most of his holy presence, is better than that which wants it. And if it be said, That this was the outward presence of God chiefly, and not so spiritual, and therefore inferiour to the Christian; which is true: Then will I say, that notwithstanding the said instances of Gods presence be not to be found with us in our Churches, yet the more spiritual and properly divine is, in a greater degree in our Churches, then that Temple. And therefore, those places of Scripture are not abused by Papists. 2. It doth no where appear in Scripture that they were commanded to build a Temple to God, as is there supposed: but when *David* entertained the thoughts of it, and *Solomon* prosecuted the same design, they had special directions how they should build it. 3. There needs no Evangelical precept to enjoin that, which both by the light of nature (as we have seen) and such a President of the Law, was pronounced sufficiently to Christians, without a new Revelation. 4. The Temple of the Jews was not a proper type of Christs body: Christ indeed, in the Gospel, compares his body to a Temple: but every similitude is not to be held a type: for then should every common shepheard have been a type of Christ, as well as *David*: and the Vine should have been a type of Christ, and what not, that bears any similitude unto Christ? But properly, they only can be called types of Christ, which were ordained and instituted of God to prefigure and shadow out Christ to come. And the Temple had not this for its end, but only it was a thing meerly incidental to it. 5. Our Temples or Churches are no less types of Christs mystical Body then was the Jewish. And the presence of God is more eminently, though not sensibly, in ours than in them. Nay, that Temple, as the worship in it, seemed to be a type of our Temples and Religion; as our Temples are a type of Heaven, the Holy of Holiest: As their Sabbath is granted by all to be but a type of our Evangelical, and our Evangelical of the Celestial. Of which Evangelical Sabbath we are in the next place to speak.

Bertram. de  
Rep. Judæor.  
cap.2.  
*Constat locum  
debitum esse,  
&c.*

Ἐνα καὶ θεῶν  
νάον ὁ θεὸς  
ἐν Ἰερουσαλὺ-  
μοις καὶ μυρίας  
ἀνάστησεν ἐμεί-  
νε πολλὰ  
συνότρυν.

Chryf. Serm.  
3. in Iudæos.

## C H A P. XII.

*Of the Second Circumstance of Gods Worship; Appointed times. Of the Sabbath or Seventh Day, how it was appointed of God to the Jews, but not by the same Law appointed to Christians: Nor that one day in seven should be observed. The Decalogue contains not all moral duties directly. Gentiles observed not a Seventh Day. The New Testament nowhere commands a Seventh Day to be kept holy.*

Ecclef. 33. 7.

8.  
9.

Gal. 4. 10, 11.

**T**H E Question and Scruple moved by ignorant, unquiet, and superstitious persons against observation of Days in order to Gods Service, is, propounded and well answered by the wise Man in *Ecclesiasticus*, saying: *Why doth one day excel another? whereas all the light of every day in the year is of the same? By the knowledge of God they were distinguished: and he altereth Seasons and Feasts. Some of them hath he made high days, and ballowed them, and some of them hath he made ordinary days.* I make no doubt but here it will be answered presently, That God did this, and appointed solemn days and seasons to the Jews, and to them only, *which things*, as St. Paul speaks, *are to be done away in Christ.* And this is very true, in great part: For those Judaical days were appointed by Gods immediate order, and by his will again evacuated and revers't at the coming of Christ: But then all days in use among the Jews were not so ordained by God; as the Feast of Purim, and the Feast of Dedication, but by humane prudence: which when they would disgrace sufficiently, and acquit themselves from, they are wont to call *Humane Inventions*; as if, because God hath in his Word signaliz'd for evil, such humane inventions as were quite contrary to his institution, none other agreeable to his word and subservient to it, were to be patiently endured: St. Paul then, when he saith, *Which things are done away in Christ*, doth undoubtedly mean the Jewishness and figurativeness of them, and not absolutely the days and times instituted to the service of God in Christ. God suffered, God approved, and, for ought doth appear, accepted well the said Commemorations of his signal mercies and deliverances at the Jews hands, until the coming of Christ: when the case was wholly altered, as that Service, but not so as to all future. For an invincible argument it is to the contrary, that one day of the week is still continued to serve God in a peculiar manner, notwithstanding after the strong attempts made, especially of late (and never before later days, either by Eastern or Western Christians, or by Reformed or Unreformed) to make the Lords day a Sabbath, and obliging Christians by vertue of the fourth Commandment in the Decalogue, nothing to that end is effected.

Indeed,

Indeed, if men will tecture and extend Gods word to that extreame, as thereby to draw every thing, out of any thing, they may reduce all moral duties unto the Ten Commandments, according to the custom of expounding them, *viz.* That where the Effect is commanded or forbidden, there the Cause likewise: and where the Outward act, the Inward: and where the *Genus*, there the *Species*: and where the Thing, there the Circumstances: and where one kind, there all of like kinds are forbidden or commanded; then were there some colour for what they say of all moral duties to be found in the Decalogue, and sins interdicted: But there is no more ground for the expounding of this so, than any other part of Scriptures: And if there were, this would make Eight of the Ten Commandments superfluous, all sins and all duties being reducible, at this rate, to those two our Saviour in the Gospel refers to, *viz.* Love of God, and Love of our Neighbours. And surely, most essential to all actions are the circumstances of time and place, and nothing can be done by Man in Religion, or out of it, without them: therefore it should seem superfluous expressly to enjoyn a time to serve God in, and distinctly from the act which unavoidably implyes it. And if it be said that not so much a time simply, as a time precisely so determined, *viz.* to a Seventh Day, and that in such and such manner to be observed, is instituted of God, then do fall to the ground the supposed naturalness, and morality of the time there commanded: and that by natural light or law, no more is commanded then time, or at most a day, but not a Seventh Day. Now if we are, being Christians, under the Law no farther than in these two respects, First, as some of it is repeated and enforced by the Law of the Gospel, given us by Christ; Secondly, as it is consonant to the Law of Reason or Nature: And that a seventh part of our time should be dedicated constantly to God is no where so positively delivered in the New Testament, as it was in the Old: nor doth the light of Nations or Nature suggest any such determinate time (for that only, and not of time in general, is all the question.) How can a Seventh Day be commanded of God?

It is not to be denied but some of the ancient heathen Philosophers and Poets, did talk of somewhat of sacredness in the Seventh Day. But first, whence had they such opinions? from the thing it self? No surely, it was a superstitious and blind admiration of the number *Seven*, of which we find so much in their writings: and especially the consideration of the Seven Planets in the Heavens, which made them think better of the Seventh Day; or cause the week to consist of so many days and no more. But what real opinion they had of that above other days, doth appear in their practise, which no monuments declare to have been in more sacred or solemn esteem than any other. And the reputed sacredness of the number *seven* is that, which *Philo Judæus* playeth upon so handsomly in his commendation of the Jewish seventh day, as may be seen in his works.

*Philo* In  
Decalog. pag.  
585. Id. De  
Opificio  
Mundi pag.  
15, 16. & 21.  
Genevæ.

And *Chrysostome* from thence takes a better argument to prove that a Seventh day is not moral, from whence several have endeavoured to prove that it is, and that in a more sacred manner than any other of the Commandments. For to perswade to a precise observation of it, these say, that God hath set a *Memento*, a *Remember* upon it, such as upon no other Commandment. Therefore, there should be somewhat extraordinary in it. And so there is indeed: For, saith *Chrysostome*, whereas all other Commandments are very agreeable to the Reason of man, and are in some degree known to him by natural light, and so need not the like intimation and advice, this of a Seventh Day to be kept holy to God, cannot be discerned by Natures light

at



at all, and therefore needeth such a Memento and Remembrancer as this to bring that to his mind which is so apt to slip out.

'Tis granted, moderner Jews, in despite of Christ and Christians, have asserted a naturalness and immutability of this Command, and an extent of it to all Nations, but this concludes not Christians, knowing from whence such Antichristian Dogmes proceed.

Now here lyes the labour, to infer a Seventh Day from the Law, obliging Christians, I say, from the letter of the Law, and not from the reasonableness of the thing it self, to which they flee, who find their other proofs too weak: and here I will not contend much with them. But all their Old Testament testimonies being more easily evaded and nulled then they are alledged by this one answer, That they speak only of Jewish Sabbaths, and so have no force at all upon us, or the same in all respects that they have upon the Jews, they must be constrained to repair only to Gospel for the Confirmation of any day separate from civil affairs, and dedicate to God. And here they are altogether to seek for any one direct or positive Precept: not one in all the New Testament can be found for any, either Seventh or First Day of the week. Whereupon they are compelled to betake themselves to the uncertain way of arguing from Example to a Rule, viz. That because they read several instances in the New Testament, of things done on the first Day of the week, in reference to Religion and the Service of God, therefore, that day ought specially and religiously to be observed: they will perhaps say, That the infinite blessing of our Redemption by Christ, and his Resurrection, is the ground of our observation, as the Creation was of theirs: This I grant to be a just and sufficient cause: but it doth not from thence follow that therefore actually it was so constituted upon that ground. We now are in quest of the Constitution it self, and not of the Reason why it should be so ordained. For many things that seem to us very reasonable, are not certainly actually ordained. And many things for which in the New Testament we may find presidents of the Apostles, or Apostolical persons, do not necessarily infer a Rule or Precept: But in the New Testament there is nothing but Examples, and they not peculiar to that day. From whence I would conclude no more than this, That the true ground of dedicating a day to the Service of God, is to be fetch'd from the light of Nature, in which all Nations religious consent: but the ground of keeping the Seventh Day, as the Seventh, was meerly Mosaical and Judaical, as *Chrysostome* also hath well gathered from the reason annexed unto it. *For in six days the Lord made Heaven and Earth, and rested the Seventh day:* whereas (saith he) God hath given us no reason why we should not commit Murder or Adultery, &c. because the command is so agreeable to nature. Again, the ground of keeping that Seventh Day which we do, is to be taken wholly from Christian Principles. Thirdly, the form or manner of observing that Day is to be taken from the Prescriptions of the Apostles, so far as they stand recorded in the New Testament, and from Apostolical practises shining successively in the following Ages of the Churches: Yet not so, as if it were not lawful for this Age of the Church to keep it more strictly and sacredly than did the very first Age of the Church, and some following it; and the rather because it is certain, that the Primitive Christians did keep two days Festival in one week to the honour of God: the ancient Seventh Day of the Jews, and the newly instituted day of the Christians, as might here be made apparent. But I shall here only add the judgment of the *Magdeburgenses* concerning the first Century of years, where they write thus: *Mention is made of the Lords*

Chryl. Homil.  
12. pag. 542.  
Antioch.

Centur. 1. l. 2.  
cap. 6.

*Lords Day*, Apoc. 1. 7. but at what time Christians separated themselves from the Jews, and began to rest on the Lords Day, is nowhere mentioned in Records; but that some rested on the Lords Day, and some on the Saturday in this Age, the contentions in the following Age do witness: Thus they.

And for the Translation they speak of to be made of the Service of God from the Saturday to the Sunday, they speak altogether without the Book of God, or of the ancient Historians of the Church. For that had had little of Christianity in it, and could serve to no end so much as to spite and reproach the Jews, as *Calvin* hath noted: For it had made indeed both against the Jews and Christians too: Them, to have the precise command of God to them, so directly violated: These, to retain the same thing which could not consist with Christianity imposed upon them, with the Circumstance of time only varied. For they who speak of Translation of a thing, cannot mean here the natural day it self translated, or more properly adjourned to the First: nor can they mean the worship of that day transmitted to this: For that was Judaical and Antichristian: And if neither of these can be allowed, what mean they to talk of changing, or translating of one day to another? And why do they not speak the truth roundly, and dare to say, That Christians instituted the First Day of the week in commemoration of the Benefits they received by Christ, without any consideration at all of any command in the Old Testament; and that it was a cessation of the Jewish Sabbath, and an introduction of a Christian, quite of another nature?

And that so it is, appeareth from the concessions made by the greatest defenders of a Sabbatical Lords Day, which I shall here contract, as necessary to satisfy the Scruples and Doubts bred by careless handlers of this subject. Things temporary in the Sabbath are these, saith Mr. Perkins. First, the Jew might not go forth on the Sabbath day, or take any journey, or do any other business of his own, Exod. 16. 29. 2. He might not kindle a fire on the Sabbath day, Exod. 25. 3. 3. Nor carry a burden, Jerem. 17. 21. These things are temporary altogether, and do not concern the times of the New Testament, &c. Secondly, It was temporary and ceremonial, as it was a special sign between God and his People, of the blessings that were propounded and promised in the Covenant, Exod. 31. 13. Thirdly, The set Day, namely the Seventh, was temporary, Deut. 5. 14. Numb. 28. 9, 10. Fourthly, That it was to be observed in remembrance of their deliverance out of Egypt, Deut. 5. 15. Thus he of things not moral in the Fifth Commandment. Now hear we what he accounts Moral: They are these three. First a Day of Rest. This we also account Moral, but not so much by the Fourth Commandment, as by a Superior Law, as we have said: and so of the Second, That it be sanctified: and of the Third, That a Seventh Day should be sanctified to an holy rest, is meely craved, and believed, before it be proved from any text of Scripture: Yea, in his following Discourse, he granteth that St. Paul wrought with *Aquila* and *Priscilla* on the Sundays, and observed the Jews Sabbath, out of Acts 18. 3, 4. but he adds, That it was out of Charity and necessity of the Salvation of them with whom he so conversed: and answereth, secondly, That though he did not keep the Sabbath (he meaneth the Lords Day, for he constantly calls the Lords Day *The Sabbath*, and too many have imitated his phrase) publickly, he might privately. He might indeed, but such privacy of which we have no knowledge, can be no Rule or Law to us.

It is said by Perkins in another place, and by his blind Followers, That the Sabbath of the Old world is the Seventh Day from the Creation, which was consecrated for Divine Service in Paradise before the Fall: And from hence they

Perkins Cases  
of Conscience.  
lib. 2. cap. 16.

Perkins his  
Digest or  
Harmony, p.  
766. Vol. 2.

Corcellæus  
diatrib. de  
Sabbato, c. 6.

Calvin. Har-  
mon. in Pent.

they have drawn an argument for the Morality, and that worthily, could it be proved what they presume. But others, that have sifted the matter more narrowly and accurately, deliver the contrary for a certain truth, *viz. That the first Sabbath observed by the Jews in the Desert, was not reckoned from the beginning of the creation, but from the day in which Manna was first rain'd down, as may be seen out of Exod. 16. v. 4, 5, 13. which two are supposed to meet together, but upon no good foundation.* But this is certain, that we find a breach of the Sabbath, and severe punishment executed upon the breakers of it, before the promulgation of the Ten Commandments on Mount *Sinai*. But to this (the best argument I find for the Antiquity of it) it is well answered, That the same reason is for the Antiquity of the Tabernacle too, which most certainly was not made till a long time after the first mention we have of it. For *Exod. 33. 7.* *Moses* is said to take the Tabernacle, and pitch it without the Camp, whenas the history following relateth the particular materials, and form, and solemn erection of it to be a good while after. So that the same difficulty is in reference to the Sabbath and it; and is thus solved by *Calvin* himself: That there were certain previous injunctions, given particularly and more rudely by God, concerning the observation of certain Rites, before that more exact delivery of them by God to *Moses* on Mount *Sinai*. And as alwayes a day or time was allotted, so likewise some special place separated from common uses, as that called here the Tabernacle, to the service of God. For had there been any proper weekly day appointed by God before *Moses*, surely we should have found some little mention thereof in the History of *Moses* from the Creation to his days, but not a word of any such thing do we find to that purpose.

CHAP:



## CHAP. XIII.

*Of the Institution of the Lords Day. That it was in part of Apostolical and partly Ecclesiastical Tradition: Festival Days and Fasting derived unto us from the same Fountain, and accordingly to be observed upon the like grounds. Private Prayers in Families, to the neglect of the Publique Worship, unacceptable to God. Of the Obligation all Priests have to pray daily according to their Office. Of the Abuse of Holy days in the Number, and unjustifiable occasions of them. Of the Seven Hours of Prayer, approved by the Ancient Church, and our First Reformers. Mr. Prinne's Cavils against Canonical Hours refuted.*

**T**HAT the Institution of the Lords day, hath no known foundation from the Command of God or Christ, may be collected from what is said. But that the Apostles, and Church Apostolical, did by their example and practice commend it to following generations of Christians, I acknowledge most true. But still there remains a knot to be untied about the force of that Constitution, whether it was only of Custom or Precept; or all the Obligation proceeded from the decrees of the Church after the Apostles. For direct Precept we find little or no Grounds in Scripture. For Practice Apostolical, and Custom upon that descending to posterity, also the accession of the Laws Ecclesiastical and Imperial, we make no scruple to acknowledge them to be very solemn and obligatory upon all good Christians. But seeing all things practis'd by the Apostles are not Obligatory, it will be worth the enquiry, under what Capacity they so acted; whether as Apostles, or as Governors of the Church in such a large sense as might be communicable to their successors. That it was not meerly and precisely an Apostolical Act to establish such a Festival, seems to appear from the  
K k k grounds

grounds found in the Law of Nature moving men to celebrate a day to God; again, that the first day of the week, being the day of our Lord and Saviours Resurrection, seems to be no other than Common Ecclesiastical Prudence, as that which agreeth most with the End it self; viz. The due commemoration of Christs resurrection on that day: but that Christ should be so Commemorated, and God so glorified, seems to me to be specially Apostolical, and so Divine, that it is not alterable by the Counsel or Decrees of the Church any time after: from whence may conveniently be reconciled the opposite opinions of both School-men and Canonists; some of whom have asserted the divine Right of the Lords day, and others the Ecclesiastical or Canonical only. For that a day be Festively observed to God, is Natural; that on such a Festival or Thanksgiving day, Christ should be magnified and God praised, is Apostolical: but that on the *First* day of the week, Christian Prudence, and the necessary power of the Church may seem to suffice. Which appeareth from the manner of celebrating the Christian Sabbath, which hath been always left to the Authority and wisdom of the Church, varying according to occasions given. For that Christians very anciently met to treat of divine matters, to communicate, to celebrate the Eucharist, and to sing Psalms, Hymns, and Spiritual Songs, *Justine Martyr* and *Tertullian*, and the famous Epistle of *Pliny* witness. And to this end they had a vacation from all worldly servile matters, as many proofs of Antiquity demonstrate. And for the dignity of this day it was, that on it, and none other, Bishops were to be consecrated by the constitution of *Leo* 1. And what are the Prerogatives of this First day of the week, are explained at large by the Ancient Fathers and Councils here not to be rehearsed.

From this Fountain of Ecclesiastical power resident in the Church, springeth the Act of instituting other days to the Glory and Praise of God, of two sorts, viz. days of Humiliation; and Exultation, or joy. For it is certain, that, after it was agreed upon that Christs Resurrection should be weekly celebrated, it was consented to also, that a Yearly Thanksgiving should be kept for the same, which was the Christians Passover; and our Easter day is immemorially practised, and without interruption derived to this present age. And therefore as well because it is the greatest matter of joy that at any time befell the Church of Christ; as because it regulateth other principal Feasts and Fasts of the Church; as lastly, because thence is plainly inferred a power in the Church of ordaining Feasts, and Fasts to the worship of God, it is called by the Ancient, *The Mother of Feasts*. And surely upon this, the Fathers of the Church produced many other *Daughter-Feasts*, not all in a year, nor an age: but according to their power to maintain and defend them; which was very difficult for them to do as becomed, under Gentile persecution: who were most severe against such Celebrities instituted by Christians to the overthrow and contempt of Gentile worship, which according to the Light of nature consisted much in this: as *Seneca* hath said in these words, *The Founders of Laws ordained Festival days, to the end that men might meet publicly in Jollity, putting some moderation to Labours, as necessary for them*. These Gentile Institutions prevailing not only to Idololatrical service, but corruption of manners, contrary to nature it self; The Ancient Fathers of the Church knew no better Antidote against such poison, than to introduce Christian Festivals,

Justin. Apol.  
2.  
Tertul. Apologet.

Leo 1. Distinct. 75. c. 1.  
Quod die, &c.

Legum Conditores Festum instruerunt, ut ad hilaritatem homines egerent, &c. Seneca de Tranquill. Animi, c. 15.

vals, whereby all the natural and Civil benefit of Vacation from Labours, friendly conversation, and such like might be enjoyed; and due worship and praise be given unto God in Christ Jesus. And therefore, *Theodoret* with other Fathers is not ashamed to profess, as a very laudable and religious occasion of Christian Feasts, That they succeeded the Idolatrous, and lewd Feasts of the Gentiles; which some (but in vain) would turn against the use of them. But they stand upon surer foundations, than to be blown down with the wind of vain doctrines blustering against them. For First, as is said, Nature it self directs to them. Secondly, Religion of all sorts ever acknowledged Festival worship. Thirdly, Apostolical practice and Prescription commend them; and Fourthly, our Church Homilies (one reason possibly they have suffered so many reproaches of ungodly men) tell us, that *Holy days were appointed by the same Authority that the Lords day was*: which as sorely as it may vex these dissenters to hear, is most true. For though it says, *with the same Authority*, it doth not from thence follow, that they by that Authority were instituted with the same sacredness. And Mr. *Perkins* is deceived who tells us, *Not a Feast except Easter, can be proved for 300 years after Christ*. Indeed *Socrates* (whom he quotes) saith the Apostles did not much concern themselves in Feasts, but his meaning plainly is, *not about such punctilio's or Circumstances of Feasts*, as gave him occasion to write about them; such as were the Contentions between the Eastern and Western Church, about the day of keeping Easter. But that Easter was Apostolical, can be no more doubted then that Sunday was so: And that fifty days after Easter (to Whitsuntide) were kept Festively, *Tertullian* witnesseth. And therefore *Cartwright* whom nothing could hold but his own fanisie, and the Genevan Plat-form, thought it safer to say (being urged with Antiquity) *I appeal from the examples [of the Ancient Church] to the Scriptures. There were other grosser Errors countenanced by Antiquity?* There were so; or there were none at all. But what greater error did Antiquity generally assert to, then this of Innovatours denying all Holy days lawful, but the Lords day? Do you appeal to Scripture to prove this? So do we. Show one place against them, if ye can. Or show that the Church where there is no precept of Scripture, in particular, may not ordain such times of Worship. When will these Scriptures appear?

For the places commonly alledged against set days, viz. *Rom. 14. 5.* I leave Mr. *Perkins* to answer sufficiently, though not absolutely, in his Cases of Conscience, *Lib. 2. cap. 16.* And that of *Galat. 4. 10.* to his Comment on the words. And that of *Colos. 2. 16.* to the now quoted place of his Cases of Conscience; intending here no formal disputation: though this Author falls into many pitiful suspicions, and imaginations of his own, in these places. As for instance, on *Galatians 4. 10.* he saith, *Indeed the Church of England observes Holy days, but the Popish superstition is cut off.* This is true, but the reason he gives, very false, which is this, *For we are not bound in conscience to the Observation of those days*: For Conscience binds every good Christian from singularizing: Conscience binds to embrace all convenient opportunities to praise and honor God. Conscience likewise binds to faithful obedience to our Ecclesiastical Superiours, in such pious exercises as these, and against which no more then the rude Effects of their private opinions, and passion hath been alledged: notwithstanding, I know how much *Gelasius*, and after

*Theodoret.*  
Serm. 7. de  
Sacrificiis.

Homily of the  
time and  
place of  
Prayer. pag.  
125.

*Perkins* Pre-  
parat. to Pro-  
blem, pag. 681.

*Tertul. Ad-*  
vers. Psychi-  
cos. cap. 14.



Davenant on  
Coloss. 2. v. 16.

him *Voetius*, have travailed in this subject: and notwithstanding his answers, I hold the Reasons of Bishop *Davenant* to be strong and Pious; given us for the observation of Holy days, in his Comment upon the *Colossians*: to which I refer the Reader, for brevity sake.

Origen. Hom.  
10 in Genes.

And for the same reason, I reduce what may be said about Fasts, to what is already said of the Feasts of the Church. For there is the very same reason of Antiquity Apostolical, for the observation of both power and Liberty of the Church, just occasions offered; Conformity to the Primitive state of the Church; Advantages of such exercises; Characteristicks of Christian, from unchristian societies and professions; which all equally infer the duty of Fasting on set days, as of Feasting; and the madness and wickedness of such Christians, as dare open their mouths against them; because no doubt but both one and other have been much abused by Roman superstition. Yet not Fasting so much as Festival days. The abuses may here be noted to be these. 1. Multitude, whereby works of Nature and Civil necessities should be so far impeded and retarded, that no small prejudice should befall the Common-wealth thereby. Indeed *Origen* saith, *Every day is to be a Festival to a Christian*, calling them Jews who observe some now and then: but his meaning is not, that every day a man should cease from his labour wholly, and only wear his best cloaths, walk about, and do nothing but worship God; but, as there he expresses himself, should go to Church daily, and not content himself with his domestique devotion, but appear before God in publique place, though not in that publique manner, as with the assembly of Christians. This still binds, as a Councill at least, if not Command; and that which, as hath been shewed already, is much better, then that which is performed within the walls of our own house or Closets, if we will take *Bucers* judgment, who speaketh thus. *When as all that we have, and are, and our very lives, we have received, and do receive daily from the free bounty of God: is it not very meet also that we should assemble daily also to render him thanks, and to renew our devotion to him, and our worship of him, by his Word and Sacraments, which he hath for this purpose appointed for us, and by daily Prayers which he requireth of us? Your Majesties therefore (he speaketh to Edward the sixth) Part it is to inforce the authority of the Divine Law, against this so great abuse of God, and unbridled profanation of Holy days.*

Bucerus de  
Regno Christi.  
lib. 2. cap. 10.

And therefore, if Sectaries Religion be examined duly, which hath procured them so much credit and esteem, amongst unknowing people, it will be found to fall short by much; of that which is approved and established by our Church. They are said to be frequent, and constant in duties (as they call them) of their Families, meaning prayers, perhaps morning and evening: this is very good and laudable. But consider we a little whence this practice hath arisen, whither it tendeth, and it is rather a defrauding God of that due which we plead for, then out-doing others. The Church, the publique house of God, is the proper place of Gods worship, and that he is more glorified in, than by home-made worship. Therefore for them to translate the Service of God out of the Church at all times, but when a Sermon calls them forth, into their own houses, and to offer the morning and evening sacrifice at home, when it ought, and may be offered in his own house, is so far from deserving the name of extraordinary Pieties, that it deserves rather

ther the name of Sacrilege. And this I speak meaning, when this proceeds either from that brutish opinion, that all places are alike to God, (which is only true, *in sensu diviso*, and not *Composito*, viz. before some one place be determined, and dedicated especially to his worship, and not after) or from the contempt of Gods house, or from dislike of the Publique worship, or from admiration of our own Gifts and a delight to show them; or lastly, a design to breed a faction in private, against the publique profession. I know likewise, and grant, that several just Impediments there are to the publique service; and in such Cases, most necessary it is, that Gods service should be performed within doors: But it is not necessary that this should be performed (as the affected manner is) in a service quite distinct from the publique, yea often quite contrary. What men speak in prayer and spiritual devotion between God and their own souls privately, they are the only proper judges of, and Christian, not Liberty only, but piety requires they should so be. But surely, when Men speak before others, as well as God, and there is nothing so much as the Place, which diversifies the worship in a Family from that in the Church, that of the Church is most proper: And not to say any thing of the Laity, no Priest or Minister of our Church ought, upon common occasions, to officiate in Prayers in Private Families, any otherwise than he is bound to do in Publique: especially if they to whom he officiates, and himself, have not performed their duties in that manner before in Publique; which when they have, then only is the proper place for another free-will offering unprescribed.

I shall not here insist on the obligation all Priests have to recite their Office, as I could; but only give this general reason, That every Priest is ordained of God by man, as a constant intercessour between God and Man in behalf of the People, and especially them, of whom he hath a Pastoral charge; and not only the nature of his Office, but condition of his Benefice requires that this he doth constantly or daily twice: the old rule being very reasonable, *viz. Beneficium requirit officium*; the temporal benefits received by the Clergy, require spiritual office. The first is daily and so should the second also be. And this is no such innovation as the contrary, that the Priest should have nothing to do but when he preaches; or that he should pray and offer to God as liketh best every single Christian, which is impossible and ridiculous; and an intolerable presumption in any man to prescribe to their Minister how he should minister to them, when he is lawfully prescribed his duty before: and if he were not, he ought to prescribe to others, not of the same order with himself, and not take Laws from them: which is the corruptest and modernest of all Innovations. But the Recitation of the Office by the Priest, is a constitution of above a thousand years standing, according to the account of them who set it lowest. *Sigebert* in his Chronicle affirmeth it began in the year 540 as *Gavantus* out of him. But I find another Chronologer to place it in the year 490 saying, *Anastasius the fifty second Pope, ordained that no Clergyman should omit his Divine Office; the office of the Mass or Eucharist only excepted*. And therefore, with excellent wisdom and advice it is in these words prescribed by the Church, before the Liturgy, *All Priests and Deacons are to say daily the Morning and Evening Prayer, either privately or openly; not being let by sickness or some other urgent cause*. And surely, as there is an Obligation upon Priests to use these prayers, there must be implied an obligation in

Barthol. Gavantus in Rubricam Brev. Tom. 2. Sect. 2 c. 5. Tit. 1. Compilatio Chronolog. ad An. 490.

in all the true sons of the Church to be present at them, and to joyn with the Priest. Which because it cannot be expected that all men well inclin'd, should be always in a capacity to do, the Priest doubtless may comply with the exigencies of others, so it be not to the prejudice of the Publique: And now considering also the many extraordinary days of Festivals, and ordinary days of Fasting, wherein especial obligation lies upon all Good Christians, so far as they can, without justifiable impediment, to appear in the house of God, and worship him, (not omitting their personal and private devotions at home) and comparing the same with the practice of Puritans, who are so strangely deluded with the great vertue of a Sermon, and extemporary prayers at home, that it goes quite against the hair, if not conscience of them, to visit Gods house upon the account of prayers and adoration only; let it be fairly judged, whether they have such cause to insult over our Religion; and not be ashamed of their gross defects, and dissonancy from all that ever professed Christianity before their days. Will their bold pretences to Giftedness (think they) in their rare way of worship, cover these foul blemishes from God, when they do not from men? But this upon the occasion of the contrary abuse of times in order to Religion, wherein the Roman Church hath exceeded and departed from the practice of the Ancient Church, which indeed had some other solemn times of worship before the fourth Century, besides Sundays and Easter day, but very few. Truly and learnedly saith *Erasmus* upon *Matthew: The Age of Hieromne knew very few Feasts except the Lords day*. And in another place he writes thus. *With the Jews some days were prophane, and some days holy, but with the Christians every day is equally* (this he speaks according to the sense of *Origen*, not excepting the Lords day) *holy; Not that Festivals are not to be observed, which the holy Fathers instituted afterward, to the more commodious assembling of Christian People, and to the worship of God; but that they were very few, to wit, The Lords day, Easter, and Pentecost, and some such like reckoned up by Hieromne. But I know not whether it be expedient to add Feast upon Feast, especially since we see the manners of Christians to come to that pass, that so much reason as there was of old, to institute them for pieties sake, so great seems there to be to antiquitate them*. Thus he. And this hath been the opinion of the Church of *England*, and the course taken in the Reforming the abuse in the number of them.

And a second abuse hath been pared off by us, seen in the end of them, which is rather to the honour of Saints, than of God or Christ, among Papists. I know at the long run, as we may so speak, they ascribe in their doctrine all to God, but not half of them have this sense, and little or nothing many times comes from them, but what is directed to the Saint they then worship. Bishop *Whitgift* doth distinguish ours from theirs many ways. This one shall suffice at present, out of him: *Neither are they [Holy days] called by the name of any Saint in any other respect then that the Scriptures, which that day are read in the Church, be concerning that Saint, and contain either his calling, preaching, persecution, martyrdom or such like*. A third, and yet worse abuse in the Roman Church is, that they celebrate the memory of some who have been no Saints; and of others who have been no good Christians, as their highly applauded *Thomas a Becket*, who indeed was villanously slain, and with gross Circumstances, but by no better authority than a man may be murther'd

*Erasmus in*  
*Matth. 11. v.*  
*30.*  
*Id. in Roma-*  
*nos. cap. 14. 5.*

*Whitgifts An-*  
*swer to the*  
*admonition,*  
*pag. 175.*



murther'd upon the high-way, and that for none of his vertues: but for sticking cloſſer to the uſurping Pope, than to Chriſt or his Prince; to whom he was a much greater Rebel than was *Cranmere*, which a very late impudent railer hath in print ſo termed, to diſgrace him and the Reformation ſo far as naked lies can prevail, without the leaſt inſtance, againſt which of thoſe Princes he lived under, or in what he died an impenitent Traitor, as he calls him. This we know, the Hall of the Jeſuites Seminary in *Rome*, is hung round almoſt with ſuch Saints as have died convicted of treaſon againſt their Prince and Country, as Judicially as ever any were. But no more of this.

There yet remains ſomewhat to be ſaid under this head, of *Times* and *Seasons* of Prayer, and that is concerning Hours of Prayers, called *Canonical*: which were retained and publiſhed by our Church, at the beginning of the Reformation, by the confeſſion of that unſatisfied and unquiet Puritan Mr. *Prinne* himſelf, who wrote againſt them, and the excellent deſign of the Reverend Publiſher of them, with great wrath and bitterneſs, and all the reaſon he could, which was little enough, God knows. *In the year* (ſaith he) *1560 was printed Orarium, or a Book of Prayers, which mentioned Canonical Hours. But in the ſecond impreſſion in the year 1564; theſe hours were quite obliterated: and ſo in the Edition 1573.* But if theſe things be ſo, the Firſt Edition is with me much more Authentique than the following; unleſs it can be proved, that ſuch alterations were made with the like authority with the firſt. For we have divers inſtances of Puritans buſie zeal to make alterations in impreſſions of ſuch books as offend their corrupt humor, and that upon their private heads; watching Preſſes that print any thing that troubles them, and purging them. Hath not the late Arch-biſhop *Laud* in his ſolid and judicious refutations of their contumelies and ſcurrilous ſlanders againſt their Governors, found out their falſeneſs, in contriving the expunging of that clauſe in the twentieth of the nine and thirtieth Articles of Queen *Elizabeth*, viz. *The Church hath power to decree Rites and Ceremonies, and authority in matters of Faith.* And having cauſed the Article with this rature, to be printed, to argue from that Copy, and ſlie moſt boldly in the faces of the Prelates, as forgers of Articles in latter Editions; when there were ſo many ancient Copies retaining that Clauſe; as that of the year 1593 and 1563 and 1605: and in the publique Records of them: And having ſo done, to ſay, the Article was never ſo printed before the year 1628: But the reaſon there given makes the matter more clear. For many ſcrupling ſuch Right in the Church, refuſed to ſwear to the Articles ſo framed: and thereupon made no ſcruple to purge them of ſuch troubleſom matter; and having ſo done, to cover their wickedneſs the better, to begin to clamour loudly againſt the Biſhops, as if in their Edition they had ſoiſted (as they ſpeak) that into them, of their private heads. And what can be a greater, or more bold preſumption in them to attempt, than in the Title of the Singing Pſalms, which never had the leaſt approbation of either Civil or Eccleſiaſtical Authority, to print theſe words, *Set forth and allowed to be ſung in all Churches of all the people together, before and after Morning and Evening prayer, and alſo, &c.* whereas they could never yet produce the leaſt colour of Authority more than groſs connivance at that will-worſhip of their own heads: For the Church never owned any other Pſalms or Singing, but what ſhe warranted by her practice in

Prinne againſt  
Coſens, pag.  
32.

Lauds ſpeech  
in the Star-  
chamber. An.  
1637. pag. 64,  
65, 66, 67, &c.

in Cathedrals, which, as it was much more ancient and solemn, so much more easie also for common people to learn, and more easie to be understood by those who are not able to joyn with them that so sing. And yet (what will not affectation of mens own invention, and spite against others drive men to say?) they boldly argue against that manner of singing, as not easily intelligible or to be learnt; and also as a way most unfit to address ones self to a Prince in, and much more to God; as if their contrived Psalming of it, were not much more obnoxious to these exceptions, and more ridiculous to be used towards any man, than the other: The only advantage these have above the Churches grave, plain, and chearful way of Reciting the Psalms, being that they are fallen into this their own way, but cannot tell how, or why, and admire it infinitely.

But to return: Can we, knowing they have been guilty of such vile Artifices, make any great scruple to think that they might play false with the said *Orarium* too, of which Mr. *Prinne* speaks? Such doings, and the disuse of these, might give occasion to the Rhemists in their Comments to affirm, that, *The Church of England hath utterly rejected Canonical Hours of Prayers.* Which is not so. Indeed she doth not impose them with that rigour, as doth the Roman Church, but commendeth the same as very godly and profitable. And there is not one book in more esteem with her, next to the Office of the Liturgy it self, than that book, to that end published by the late Reverend Bishop of *Durham*, Dr. *Cofens*: notwithstanding all the dirt cast in the face of it and him, by Mr. *Prinne*. And notwithstanding the three notable abuses noted amongst the Papists, by Master *Perkins* in the use of the Canonical Hours; *First, in binding to them upon mortal sin*; This we acknowledge to be an abuse, unless the persons have brought themselves under any Rule or Order which requires such services, (as such may lawfully be) and wilfully neglect the same: *Secondly, binding only to those hours, whereas those hours differ not from others*; But here we are to distinguish; first, between binding to those hours only, as if it were not permitted to use them at any other hours, which I know none do: and not binding them to any others, but them only; this is lawful. *Secondly, between binding to hours for the Hours sakes, and for Orders sake.* Indeed Hours (as is solidly and very philosophically argued) differ not in nature one from another: But emergencies and occasions may diversifie them, and the devotions belonging to them, without any just objection to be made to the contrary: A Third abuse noted by Mr. *Perkins*, is, *That a man may say the Canonical hours of one day for another*; which may be an abuse, or no abuse, as the matter is ordered. To neglect wilfully ones usual prayers, is certainly ill: but having so done, to double his prayers the next day, is no such error as may be supposed.

Much besides this may be said out of the Authority of the Church, and more out of Scripture, than may be found for some things by Puritans religiously observed: Much likewise is here wont to be said about the Hours themselves, the reason, and number of them: but I cut off all them at present, and resolve all into the general reasonableness and piety of such a practice; and the manifold benefit which may accrue unto the serious and devout user of them, though he ties not himself to any one form strictly: and so shall rest, till I can hear what can be objected worthy of a Christian against them, more than I have found already, which may be as well objected against Morning and Evening prayer, as them.

CHAP.

## CHAP. XIV.

*The Third thing to be considered in the Worship of God, viz. The true Object, which is God only. That it is Idolatry to misapply this Divine Worship. What is Divine Worship properly called. Of the multitude and mischiefs of New distinctions of Worship. Dulia and Latria, though distinct, of no use in this Controversie. What is an Idol. Origen's criticisme of an Idol, vainly rested on. What an Image. What Idolatry. The distinction of Formal and Material Idolatry, upon divers reasons rejected. The Papists really Idolatrous, notwithstanding their good Intentions pretended. Intention and Resolution to worship the true God, excuse not from Idolatry. Spalato, Forbes, and others, excusing the Romanists from thence, disproved. That Idolatry is not always joyned with Polytheism, or worshipping more Gods than one. How the Roman Church may be a true Church, and yet Idolatrous.*

**F**ROM the nature, kinds, acts, circumstances of Place and Times of Prayer, we pass to the object of this worship of Invocation and Adoration: which is the most important of all; and which, as duly observed, is the end, complement and perfection of all Religion; so mistaken, is the foulest of all errors, and the highest of all provocations and affronts of almighty God; who protesteth by his Prophet, upon this occasion, *I am the Lord, that is my name, and my glory will I not give unto another, neither my praise unto graven Images.* This therefore it were superfluous to prove, which all Christians, yea almost all the world, as well Unchristian, as Christian, do h readily and unanimously assent to, That God only is the proper object of Divine or Religious worship. And they that glory that they stick firmly to this, what do they more than do Infidels and Heathens, who all hold that God is to be worshipped, with supremest worship,

Isa. 42. 8.



and that Idolatry is a notorious error and offence against him? This I say, all rational men assent to in the notion; that the worship of the true God, or which seems to be the very same, the true worship of God, is to be given only to God; and yet fall flat into the Practice of that great sin.

For though Idolatry be so odious in its name, yet in its nature it is very pleasing and ravishing of our senses; and hath of late days been so fairly and neatly trimmed up, by the fine wits and curious hands of men, and they especially Christians, and they more especially Catholics (God bless us) that now there is either no such thing to be found in the world, or that, the least sin, one of them, in the world. And this is brought about by the ministry, and help of innumerable distinctions; which I think may be reduced to these two heads: viz. to those concerning the Act of worshipping, and those concerning the Object of worship. Concerning the Act, we find such as these very common and current; first, *Natural* and *Civil*, and *Divine* and *Religious*: And these again *Properly Divine*, or *Improperly*; *Supream* and *Inferior*; *Direct* and *Indirect*; *Absolute* and *Relative*; *Ultimate* and *Subalternate* or *Subordinate*; *Mediate* and *Immediate*: *For its own sake* or *for anothers sake*. Again, for its own sake, which we worship, as a thing in it self, or as a Representation of another: All these, (but these are not all) to be found in Learned Authors books, to rectify the worlds errors in its Religion. And besides these, more may be found concerning the Object, but this one shall I only name, which is their strongest Hold and Refuge. That, to secure them from all assaults of Adversaries; this, to receive them when they shall by strong hand at any time be beaten out of their fastnesses: And that is that modern, but very famous distinction of *Material* and *Formal*. So that some of no mean knowledge, have thus defended themselves: What if (for instance in the Mass) we should by error worship that as God, which is not God? yet this would be but Material Idolatry, at the most, and not Formal: seeing we believe that to be very God, which we so adore: and Material Idolatry (with such circumstances) we must suppose, is one of the least sins that we can be subject to. Thus have some discoursed to me, though 'tis well known, some others of them, as *Costerus*, do acknowledge, that if Catholics miss their mark, and that be not really God, which they with divine worship adore in the Sacrament, they are gross Idolaters. Of this we shall speak more by and by. Now are we to consider first, of the first sort of distinctions; to pass over all which, by a particular examination, would be too tedious a task for my self, and Reader too: I shall therefore only examine the most reasonable, and comprehensive of them: and them I take to be that of Worship Civil and Divine; and of Absolute and Relative: not omitting altogether others.

And to understand clearly what is meant by Divine Worship, we are to enquire, whether the Act makes the Worship, or the Object; For all worship, as other Acts moral, takes its specification from the Object, as Philosophers say; then, unless the Object be Divine, or God himself, cannot the Worship be Divine; and so by consequence a man cannot give Divine Worship, though he would never so fain, unto an object not Divine: and so cannot, though he would, commit Idolatry; because the worship it self is not Divine, but much inferior: because the object is such, which constitutes not Divine Worship, being some Creature. But  
if

if the Act in its own nature be intrinsically Divine, it would be known, what is that which makes it so. For they say, all acts external are equivocal and dubious in themselves; and indifferent to Civil, Religious, Inferiour, or Supream worship: and that nothing can be concluded from thence Idolatrous. For we bow the head, we bend the knee, we fall down at the feet of men many times, whom we give no Idolatrous worship unto, nor are charged by any understanding reasonable person so to do. And what they affirm of all outward Reverence or Worship, I see no reason but may be said of all inward Adoration too, *viz.* that it is Equivocal and indifferent to Divine and Human Reverence; unless it be determined and specified by somewhat besides it self. For *Fear* and *Love* and *Reverence* may be, and that inwardly, exhibited to the Creature, and the degrees of all these may be greater and more intense towards our Prince, whom we so reverence, humble our selves before, and Petition; than when in this manner we address our selves to God, and yet this not reputed Idolatrous worship: Yea we openly profess, we humbly, earnestly, and with all our hearts, desire such a thing from man, and so I doubt not but many do with greater affection and inward sense than they generally seek to God, and yet no man charges them with Idolatry. So that the inward acts of worship are equivocal no less than the outward; and consequently, no act in its self Idolatrous; or of it self. And thus have we brought the matter to that pass, to relieve distressed Catholiques, that ordinary Heathens may evade the charge of Idolatry, though they never knew the true God. And if they know, and profess upon occasion, to worship the true God, yet may they perform all outward acts of Worship generally reputed Divine, provided their Intention be sincere, and their hearts upright before God: which elusions and evasions the Jesuites have made great use of, in their compliance with the grossest Idolatry Heathens are subject to, in the East Indies; as *John de Palafox* hath plainly and roundly charged them, to *Innocent* the Tenth: showing at large, how under the favour of such new-invented and minted distinctions, (never thought of without detestation, by the Ancient Church) they have presumed to converse with, and in all outward appearance communicate with Idolatrous Heathens, in their Temples and Idols. And why not, if all outward worship falls short of Divine; and their intention inward be not to give Divine Worship to them?

For to define Idolatry, as doth *Azorius*, to be, *That whereby the worship which is due to God, is given to another*: and again, *Then is Idolatry committed, when we ascribe Divine honor to created things, for their own sakes*: what does all this signifie, when it is not agreed upon; What is properly Divine Worship? but sometimes Divine Worship is defined to be that which is proper to God, and what is proper to God, is not plainly determined: and sometimes, that which is proper to God, is called Divine Worship: For to help us out with the distinction of *Dulia* and *Latria*, is to give us hard words for easie, and that is all: and especially to add hereunto that unknown to ancient and uncircumscribed to modern Ages, *Hyperdoulia*.

For though it doth not hold constantly true, that these two words are so distinguished in Scripture or Ancient Greek Writers, either Ecclesiastical or Profane, as not sometimes to be used promiscuously and interchangeably as might by instances be made undeniable, yet cannot we not deny, but generally they have their distinct significations, and the things by them signified are very distinct: and it is one of the easiest things in the world, to put a difference between the Notions of *Servile* Worship (which

See Joannes de Palafox Episc. de Jesuitar. Societate Extinguenda, &c. ad Innocent. 10. p. 23, 24. apud S. A. mour.

Azorius Institut. Moral. To. 1. l. 9. c. 10.

is *Dulia*; and *Divine*, which is *Latria*: yet in the exercise of these acts, it is one of the difficultest things of all, to distinguish, which is which: seeing it is hard to say, whether the intention of the worshipper only, or the Act it self precisely taken, or the Object, makes the worship Divine. The Object cannot be it, because there could be no Idolatry committed in such cases: For, as is said, If the worship be not Divine the Act cannot be Idolatrous; for all other worship (say they) may be exhibited to a Creature: And it should not be Divine, according to this opinion, that maketh the Object to give the Divineness to the Act. Again, there can instance be given in no one act, that in it self is incommunicable to the Creature, according to these mens *Theology*. Therefore lastly, all the specification of Idolatrous acts must consist in the Intention of the mind, and that intention is seen in a profession of Religiously worshipping a thing for its own sake: For so *Azorius* holdeth, that even *Latria* (which if any act with them be Properly Divine, must needs be so) it self may be given to *Saints*, and to *Images*, provided it be not given for their own sakes, but for Gods sake. Now, it being impossible that any rational man should thus strictly give, or intend to give Divine Worship to any thing for its own sake, which he denies to be God; it follows that no man can commit Idolatry, because every man gives that worship he gives in a divine manner, either not for its sake, to which it is immediately directed, but for Gods sake, whom he sufficiently understands; or with an opinion that really such a thing as he so worships, is God.

But to make the matter fairer and safer on their side, they flee to *Origen*s opinion, or Criticism of an Idol, as different from an Image. An Idol (saith he following St. Paul to the *Corinthians*) is nothing in the world: An Idol is a fiction made like to nothing in nature; but an Image is the likeness of something: and fain would they, if they dare be so bold (for as yet they touch the matter somewhat timorously and tenderly) cut off all colour for accusation of them of Idolatry, by defining Idolatry to be the worship of an Idol; and an Idol, to be that only which is not in nature, nor like to any thing in the world: But they worship only such things as either have natural being, or represent somewhat natural; therefore they are no Idolaters: But I shall here demand bluntly of them, Is it not then Idolatry to worship the Creature natural and visible for its own sake, with *Latria*? I will suppose their answer, for shame, *It is*. Why then read we in their books *Origen*s wit rather than judgment so vainly and idly abused? Surely *Origen* there spake like a School-boy, wittily, rather than like a School-man, Theologically: And they are worse then Children that draw his words to a solid definition of Idolatry. For what says *Gulielmus Parisiensis*? When such kind of worship [*Latria*] or obsequiousness is given to another, whether the thing be, or whether it be not, and what ever it be, it is an intolerable injury and affront to God, to be exterminated with all fire and sword, &c. And doth not the Scripture expressly call the Golden Calf an Idol? saying, And they made a Calf in those days, and offered Sacrifice unto the Idol, and rejoiced in the works of their own hands. Truly therefore (whether Grammatically enough, I will not enquire) saith *Philastrius*, *Ipsum nomen Idoli species doli est*, &c. The very name of an Idol implies deceit, and a prevaricating of the form of any thing, according to the Greek Etymology, is so cal'd.

It is therefore first to be known, what is an Idol, that we may know better what is Idolatry: For it is too common a mistake to think that the Idol makes the Idolatry, and not the Idolatry the Idol: True it is indeed, that according to the course of Nature, a thing must be before it be worshipped,

*Et cet Imaginis  
Dei cultus fit  
Latriæ, non  
continuo sequi-  
tur ut rei cre-  
atæ tribuatur:  
quoniam ima-  
ginatur non  
propter se sed  
propter Deum.  
Id. Quinto.  
1 Cor. 8. 4.*

*Guliel. Paris.  
de Legib. c.  
23. Cum hujus-  
modi cultus aut  
obsequium ad  
aliud transfe-  
ratur, siue illud  
sit, siue non sit,  
&c.  
Ad 7. 4.  
Philast. Hæ-  
res. 60. post  
Christ.*



ped, but speaking in the Christian sense, certain it is that nothing is an Idol before it be worshipped: For until such an Act be directed to it, it is but an Image, or some innocent laudable representation of a thing of Gods making; then it becomes an Idol when it is worshipped. It were vain to object that the Images of Saints or God himself are Idols in themselves: And it is as vain to answer, that they are Representations of most holy persons, and not such as were the Images of the Heathen, representing Devils or Imaginary Gods; for neither the one nor other are Idols in themselves and most certain it is that either of them may be made Idols at the pleasure of Superstitious man: and the Epigrammatist spake more like a Divine, than such Schoolmen, who saith *Non quisquis fingit sacros de marmore vultus*

Mart. Epig.

*Ille Deos fingit, qui colit ille facit.*

Not he that makes Images of Gods, makes Gods, but he that worships them, he makes the Gods and the Idol too. And therefore as no works of Nature, neither Sun, nor Moon, nor Angel, nor Cherubin, nor Saint, are of themselves Idols; so no work of Art made to the likeness of any thing, is an Idol, until it partaketh of the worship due to God, and then the Image intended for the true God, becomes an Idol: And therefore we utterly deny the definition by Romanists given of an Idol, that *It is the Effigies of some false God, which representeth an empty and vain Deity.* S. Augustine much better; *Pagans worship things which are, but are not to be worshipped for Gods.* And true it is, there is not only Metaphorical Idolatry of the brain or Imagination, when the heart is devoted more to some created thing than to the Creatour; but proper also, when a man frames to himself an object within himself, and directs his worship to it, as to God; for still the general definition given by the best advised among Papists, *viz.* That it is Idolatry to give divine worship to any thing but God, takes hold of this also: And it was an old piece of Epicurism, which I have heard alledged in behalf of outward representations of God, *viz.* that we cannot conceive of God without some material *Quidditie*, as they call it, in our brain; and it is much the same Case, whether we frame a *sensible*, or a *Mental* Image of God: I confess this; but *Tully* was the best Catholique in this point, when he derided *Epicurus* his sensual divinity, for being able to think nothing of God but under sensible forms. It is very true, we cannot conceive either what God is, or any Spirit, but we must cloath him with figure & form answerable to material things; and to conceive so of Spirits created, is only an error in Philosophy, or the nature of things inferring no superstition natural: But there is no necessity a man should think with himself, what God is; for then he must needs circumscribe him; but that he is, Simply and Abstractly, and so ought we to worship him: yet if any man shall, through the infirmity of our understanding, generally conceive of God under some shape, he doth not thereupon necessarily fall into Idolatry, no, though he uses it as a means to worship by, so he makes it not the term of his service to the setting aside of God himself, when he so worships. As the framing a sensible Image of God, is no Idolatry, nor Idolatry in the strictest sense to worship God by mediation or help of that: but to make any Image of God was always interdicted, as tending naturally to Idolatry; and if it should never be used in any Religious way, yet were it no better than a blasphemous attempt, to compare God to any likeness of Colour, Wood, or Stone; or the likeness of any of these to the nature and form of God, as St. Paul tells the *Athenians* plainly in the *Acts*; *We ought not to think that the Godhead is like to gold or silver, or stone graven by art or mans device.* And yet it is well known, with a

*Idolum est falsi  
alicujus numi-  
nis effigies &  
simulacrum,  
quod nomen in-  
ane & vanum  
representat.*  
Azorius ib. c.  
11.

*Pagani ea co-  
lunt quæ sunt,  
sed pro diis  
colendi non  
sunt.* August.  
Cont. Faust.  
Manich. l. 2. c.

*Calbus obf. Ci-  
cero de Natu-  
ra Deorum l.*

*2. Nihil est diffi-  
cilius, quam à  
consuetudine  
oculorum aci-  
em mentis ab-  
ducere. Ea dif-  
ficulas in-  
dixit & vul-  
gos imperitor;  
& similis Phi-  
losophos imperi-  
torum, ut nisi fi-  
guis hominum  
constitutis, ni-  
hil de diis pos-  
sunt immorta-  
libus cogitare.*

Acts 17. 29.

Scho.

Bellarm.

Vide Lyram  
in Exod. 20.  
Damascen.  
Orthod. Fid.  
&c.  
Μηδὲνα δὲν  
τὴν κατὰ  
συνένοιαν, ὅτι  
ἀρχέτυπον ἐν  
ἐνίσταται.  
Theodoret.  
Serm. 2. in  
Græcos.

Scholastick distinction newly invented and accommodated to the case, how boldly and impiously this is practised by the Romanists, and defended by the learnedest of them: however there are sundry very grave men amongst them who declare against it; but in vain. The Greeks, who are more then enough devoted to Image-worship, and the moderners the worse, yet (God be thanked) have kept themselves pure from this abomination: And *Damascen* pronounces it a folly and extream impiety to figure the Divinity. *Nicephorus* Patriarch of *Constantinople* (as *Leo Allatus* hath set him forth) affirms it a crime to be punished with death, to make the Image of God: But none of all these, nor the constant practise of all Christian Churches, move the resolute admirers of the inventions of their own brains, and works of their own hands; but on they will go to prodigious practises in this kind sheltering themselves under the protection of a Church that cannot fail or deceive them; and a wretched distinction or two coyned on purpose to help them out of the mire.

But it is time now to consider the second main shelter, from the charge of Idolatry made against the Roman Church; and that is from the distinction of *Formal* and *Material* Idolatry: by which they would perswade us that, first, having a certain knowledge of the true God; and next always intending most sincerely to worship only that true God, though possibly they should err in the object, yet the crime of Idolatry cannot cleave unto them; and especially when we hear them so solemnly and zealously protest against worshipping any Creature, what ever we can possibly instance in, as God. The vanity of this protestation we may have occasion to discover by and by. Now we call in question the foundation of all; and that is, their distinction of *Formal* and *Material* Idolatry, upon this four-fold account: First, that if it were reasonable, it were notwithstanding altogether superfluous: For, what more can be honestly implied hereby, than was of old, in that distinction of *Ignorantia facti* and *Juris*, *Ignorance of the thing done*, and *Ignorance of the Law against which this fact is committed*. Ignorance, that such a Law there is, which prohibits divine or supream worship to be given to the Creature, no man can plead: but Ignorance of actual Idolatry in such kind of worship, as by error and false supposition is committed, a man may possibly alledge, and that colourably. Now, what can they make *Formal* Idolatry, but such a Divine Worship as is given to that which is not God, knowingly and willingly? And what else do they mean by *Material* Idolatry, but Divine Worship falsely applied to that which by nature is not capable of it, as not God, though it be really believed to be God? And what is this else but Ignorance of the fact? And if so, what makes this new Invented distinction here of *Formal* and *Material* Idolatry? Secondly, this distinction is very rudely and ignorantly made against the Rules of Logick. I know there is nothing more ordinary than to distinguish a thing, and consider it *Materially* and *Formally*: but there never was received any such division as good, which made Matter and Form of the same thing, distinct Kinds; or made Parts several Species. A man may be considered according to his Matter or according to his Form: but who ever went about to divide human nature or humanity into a *Formal Man* and a *Material Man*? Or, to take an instance nearer to our purpose, of Adultery; A man may consider it in its Formality and Materiality, but no advised man can divide Adultery into *Formal* and *Material*. For the general Rule makes against all such attempts; which tells us, that nothing can be, or subsist without its form: so that  
either

either there is no Adultery or Idolatry at all, or it must be as well Formal as Material: unless we would be so vain and ridiculous to call them *Formal*, as we sometimes do a *Formal Man*, when he is phantastical and affected: or we should use the term *Formal*, for that which doth appear in all its outward formalities, as we before distinguished Schisme into *Formal* and *Real*, or *Material*, or *Virtual* and *Formal*. And in this sense the contrary sense is much more true. For in exhibiting outward worship in Divine manner, unto that which is not God, all the formalities of Idolatry do appear; what ever the intention, which doth not appear, may be. It will here doubtless be said, that in that common case put by Casuists, of a Man who companies with a woman in a conjugal way, stedfastly and unfainedly believing that she is his own lawful wife, doth commit material adultery, but not formal: and so in Idolatry, as the case may be put: But I make no doubt to affirm, that such an Act of Adultery, so far as it is Adultery, and such Idolatry, so far as it is Idolatry, are both Formal as well as Material: and the only difference between them and those they call *Formal*, consists only in Ignorance or knowledge of the Fact done: For either such Acts are sins, or not sins: If not sins, then neither Formal nor Material Adultery, or Idolatry; if they be sins, to what can they be reduced but to Adultery and Idolatry? And that when they have the most favourable circumstances they are sinful: *Parisensis* thus clearly determines, *If a man knows a woman not his own, for his own wife; or worships Lucifer instead of Christ, he sins; because God would have turn'd away his heart from such a great Evil, if his sins hindered not, which he had before committed.* Thus he. So that the issue of this question comes truly to that which some Romanists acknowledge, that all Idolatry derives it self originally from the understanding, though it be an Act of the will principally: and that it is because a man knows not actually what he does, when he commits Idolatry. For surely, unless (to grant something to quarrellers, which prejudices little our Cause) we except some prodigious persons and desperate: no man worships what he is perswaded is not God, with supream worship; and so consequently, no man commits wilful Idolatry. And therefore, the only equal way of estimating the Criminalness of Idolatry, is from the measure of knowledge in man: and the means of discerning an Increated from a Created Object of Worship. It is therefore to very little purpose, that the Arch-bishop of *Spalato*, and after him, *Forbes* Bishop of *Edinburge*, and after them, other very learned men of these present days, alledge in excuse of Papists from Idolatry in the Mass, when they accept of their detestation of worshipping Bread, or any thing Created, but only God: For 'tis no demonstration or proof at all, that they do not do it, because they say they do not do it: For here are two contrary suppositions made by contrary Parties. The one holds that the natural bodies of the Eucharistical Elements are not present, nor have any being: the other holds that they are there, as really as ever. Again, both agree that they worship that which is there, what ever it be: therefore deny they it a thousand times, they have nothing to save themselves from the actual adoration of those Creatures, but a supposition that they are not there: but our opinion affirming positively that there they are, no man of us can hold opinion that they worship not the Creature, and so are not Idolatrous. For as *Maimonides* quotes *Themistius* the Philosopher speaking well, *Natura rerum non sequitur opiniones hominum: sed opinioniones*

*Si quis mulierem cognoscit non suam pro uxore, vel adoret Luciferum, dicitur Gulielm. Parisiensis de Leg. c. 21.*

*Maimonides  
More Neboc.  
Part. I. c. 71.*

*niones*



Adamus Tan-  
nerus Theolo-  
giz Scholast.  
Tom. 3. Di-  
sp. 5. Quest.  
7. Dub. 1. num.  
2.

*niones hominum debent sequi naturam rerum.* The Nature of things do not follow the persuasions of men, but the persuasions or opinions of men, ought to follow Nature: That is, not only Idolatry which men are persuaded is Idolatry, but that which in it self is so; though men be persuaded of the contrary; yea though they mean nothing less then to commit Idolatry: as will appear from *Tannerus* in this his explication of Idolatry. He is judged (saith he) to give Divine Worship to the Creature, who directly and expressly, or indirectly and implicitly intendeth, to beget such opinion of it, as in truth agrees only to God. He directly intends, who really supposes falsely any Creature to be God, and intends to worship it as God: or certainly, he who otherwise out of perverted affection, desires to worship that which he well knows to be a Creature, as God. He intends indirectly, who no ways intending directly to honour a Creature as God; yet outwardly notwithstanding this, doth bestow divine honor on the Creature, as God. So that in the judgment of sober men, he may be thought to account the Creature for God: as if any man through fear of death should sacrifice to Idols.

Therefore if actually a man worships that which is not God, his intention to worship only the true God, can relieve him no farther, than his opinion and intention to accompany with his own wife, excuses him from *Casual Adultery*, in lying with another woman: and that is but little, unless circumstances be such as may render the ignorance of the Fact invincible (as the y say) or unavoidable: And the intention and opinion, if they be against ordinary presumptions to the contrary, do not excuse. Now, to apply it to the last Case of Christ corporally present in the Sacrament: This is agreed upon by us, that what Christ saith to be so, is infallibly true, seem it never so contrary to our outward senses. But seeing the words of Christ, according to the like expressions in Holy Writ, where things that bear Analogy with one another, are said positively to be one another, (as where *St. Paul* saith, *Believers are Christs bone, and Christs flesh*, which is not true in the natural sense, but Metaphorical; for otherwise, unbelievers might be said so to be, which *St. Paul* never intended) do not necessarily infer that sense; and all the ends imaginable are attainable no less by the spiritual sense, and metaphorical acceptation of the words, than by the more gross and natural: And lastly, to suppose what is said above concerning this subject, testimony of senses bear witness to the contrary, as much after Consecration as before; the upshot of the business will be this, Whether there remains any such infallible inducements to produce an opinion of such a thing there being; whether such grounds unresistible there be for to found such an intention, that may excuse from error. And therefore I absolutely deny *Spalatoe's* opinion, saying, *I answer, I acknowledge no Idolatrous crime in the adoration of the Eucharist, so long as the intention is directed aright: For they who teach that Bread, to be no longer bread, but the body of Christ, &c. For if they knew that the Body of Christ did not lye hid under the species, and his blood under those of Wine, they would not so worship: This I say satisfies not, because they have no sufficient grounds that so it is, or so Christs words are to be understood. Secondly, and as to this point principally; because Idolatry is primarily a defect and error in the understanding, as their own men confess; and only secondarily and by consequence in the will or purpose; which altogether overthrows the moderate sense of Forbes likewise, to say no more. For as for that other evasion and purgation whereby*

De Republ.  
Eccl. Lib. 7.  
cap. 11. num. 2.

Forbes ubi  
supra. p. 439.

Whereby they would fetch off Papists from Idolatrous worship in the Eucharist; because there can be no doubt made but Christ may be adored, as *Aufins* known words are, in the Eucharist with all outward and bodily, as well as mental worship, is much less to the purpose: For, This quite changes the question, which is wholly about the *εἰσάγωγα* (as the ancients call them,) the objects appearing, whether they be Christ, and to be worshipped as Christ. For, Christ in the Sacrament, we may worship, without exceptions of any divine or corporal manner. Christ's body and blood are really present in the Eucharist, we grant, and in a more eminent manner than in other places, or divine ordinances: but when we hear him say, *The faithful receive the body and blood of Christ in themselves, corporally, but yet after a spiritual, miraculous and imperceptible manner*; we grant the manner to be wonderful and imperceptible, but we cannot grant it to be *Corporally* and *Spiritually* in the same respect, without a contradiction: For, What is *corporally* to receive a thing, but *modo corporali, after a corporal manner*, and therefore to correct, as it were, that Expression with that which follows, *viz. Modo tamen spirituali, yet after a spiritual manner*, is quite to destroy what he seem'd to say before: For, Nothing can be received Corporally, after a spiritual manner. And it is much more intelligible than that of the *Romanists*, which saith, That the Body of Christ may be received spiritually and bodily: For the body, according to them, is taken into the mouth, and so bodily received by the wicked, and unbelievers; and it is by the faithful besides received by Faith, spiritually, which may stand together: But to suppose any spiritual way to be explicatory of the corporal way of receiving Christ, is to suppose contradictions: But this belongs to another place.

Let us now touch the third exception I make against the distinction of *Material* and *Formal* Idolatry, taken from the Novelty of it, and singularity, as never heard of before late dayes; when extremities put mens wits to study for new forms of Speech, to dress up the new body of Divinity framed to themselves: Why did not the Heathen come off so? For surely they might: Why did not this enter into the head of the ancients School-men, who, I dare say, make no mention of it? How comes it about that the ancient Fathers and Councils knew no other Idolatry than that which even modern Papists approve of, when the soberer mode is on them, *viz. The worshipping as God*, that which is not God; without any notice taken of *Material* and *Formal* worship? contenting themselves with the general distinction of *Ignorance* of the *Law*, and *Ignorance* of the *Fact*: or wilful Ignorance, and unwilling: Or vincible and invincible. Surely this implies somewhat singular in this case, which they either are ashamed to express, or can not; which latter is my case: For, I confess, I see no reason why we may not distinguish two sorts of Heresie as well, two sorts of Schism, two sorts of Adulterie, two sorts of Drunkenness and Murder, *Material* and *Formal*, as of Idolatry: And yet we hear little or no mention of this distinction, but only as it is applyed to Idolatry; which, besides what is above-said, renders it more suspected; and the coyners and users of it.

Fourthly, and lastly, The dangerousness of this distinction, and apparent damage it doth to Christian Religion, declares it to be wicked and intollerable; while it both opens a way to all carelessness in wor-

M m m

shipping

shipping, we know not how, nor what, contrary to our Faith; and then when we may receive competent information of our error, and should repent, it lulls us asleep in that greatest of all sins, and hardens our hearts against repentance and amendment; because, at the most and worst, we are certified, it is but *Material Idolatry*, and material Idolatry is the least of all sins, if we mean well.

And thus have we seen what havock is made with Idolatry; and whereas my, perhaps private, opinion is this, that God hath made that generally most easie and obvious unto us, which is most necessary to be done, or avoided by us; and Idolatry is the greatest of all sins, next to Atheism; and therefore should be most easie to be judged of, and apprehended; such and so many have been of late the subtilties and deviles of men, that now it is one of the hardest things to know what is Idolatry, and when it is committed; and that amongst Christians too, the first principle of whose Religion is, the worship of the only true God, in Christ Jesus.

True it is, That it is assented unto generally by Christians on all sides almost, that it is Idolatry to worship any thing as God which is not, but we are little the nearer for this, because it is made so doubtful and difficult to judg, what is divine and proper worship. And secondly, when we intend such worship to a false God, which happens to be given: For, upon supposal that we do worship a false Deity, yet if we intend to worship only the true, all is well and safe: But then, if it be doubted (as well it may) seeing all men naturally desire and intend to worship the true God, how there should be any Idolaters in the world, or any such sin as Idolatry: This difficulty hath much perplexed the Patrons of *Formal* and *Material* Idolatry: For the Heathens themselves could scarce, if such a distinction may be allowed, be convinced of the one; and Christians may easily be convinced of the other: For, I see nothing of consequence replied to the instances of the learned amongst the reformed, whereby it doth plainly appear, That the wiser Heathens (and if we go no further our turn is served) did not only, as all men, intend to worship the true God, but in their writings and minds did reduce all those various Gods to one: And though they worshipped Images of Gods, they declared, they did it not for the Image sake, but for Gods sake; and for their own sake; that they might, by means of them, obtain favor of the God they worshipped ultimately. A modern instance we have in the *Spaniards* conversing with, and converting the *West Indians*: They were very zealous, as a late rude Historian hath delivered, against the monstrous worshipped Idols by the *Indians*, and broke them to pieces (as well they might) with great indignation, and severe menaces against the servers of them; accusing them of gross Idolatry and stupidity in worshipping such foul objects to the contempt and dishonor of the true God: To this some of the freest and wisest answered: You worship Images as well as we, do you not? Yes, said the Christians, but we do not so worship the Image, but we worship the true God besides, knowing very well that those things before us are not God: And so do we, replied the Heathens: We know very well, that this we see is not God himself, but we worship our God by this; and have found by experience that he answers us by this, as well as yours: What those

Christians

Gage Histor.  
West-Indies.

Ἀνελών δὲ πρὸς  
κρίσεως τὴν  
προσκύνησιν,  
ἐκ αὐτοῦ οὐσιν,  
κρίσει πάλιν  
ἐκ εὐσε-  
προσκύνησιν.  
Τῶν γὰρ ἀπο-  
πατῶν ἡ  
φρακὴν μὲν  
τὸς ἀνδ. ὅπως  
τῶν ἐκ ὅτων  
δῶν, προσ-  
ἀγειν δὲ αὐ-  
τὸς πάλιν τῇ  
τῶν ποιημά-  
των δαλσία.  
Theod. Ha-  
veric, Fab. l.  
§. c. 3.



Christians did answer this, is not said; neither could they say any thing whereby they should excuse themselves and justly accuse others, that shall so defend and explain themselves, of Idolatry.

Therefore of late hath a very grave and learned person pitch'd upon an unheard of opinion concerning this, to salve the reputation of Christians labouring under this grand imputation; which is this, That there is no Idolatry, but where more Gods than one are worshipped: The ground and motive to which opinion is this; because, he that worships more than one God, must inevitably worship a false God; because there is but one True God: The inclusive part of which opinion and argument, *viz.* That, without all excuse, such are Idolaters, I readily grant; but not the exclusive: That only such, and no others, are: And my reasons are these; First, because none of the Christian Fathers of old ever framed or received such a Restriction of Idolatry: and that they did not, I need no better argument than may be taken from the learned Author himself, of this opinion: For being so thoroughly vers'd in antiquity as he was, some suffrage of the Fathers, some record of the Church must needs have fallen into his hands, and so undoubtedly would have fallen from his pen, confirming his opinion; but none we find produced. Secondly, I see no reason of departing without greater necessity than hath appeared as yet, from the consonant judgment hitherto of the Church of *England*: which, though it hath not in a formal decree, declared this point; yet so far as her opinion doth appear in the writings of the Principal of the Church; it is to the opposing of that sense of Idolatry; as hath in part been shown by others; and make no doubt but might further, by the same hand, as he affirmeth; finding it not difficult to do it my self. Thirdly, They, for relief of whom, surely this opinion was chiefly thought of and asserted, will not own the invention: For, though they like nothing more, and alledg nothing oftner to retund the force of our arguments proving them Idolatrous, than the judgment of so learned a man as he, against us, and in defense of themselves; yet they certainly disliking the Premises upon which such a conclusion is inferred, and sticking only to the Conclusion, *viz.* That they are not guilty of Idolatry, can take no more shelter from thence or benefit, than can he that denies the Conclusion and grants the Premises: For, I would thus expostulate, first, with the Author; Whether, if Intention directed rightly doth not excuse from Idolatry, the *Romanists* may not be said to be Idolatrous? I make no question but he that holds, as he doth, that there is no transubstantiation, would grant they were, upon such a supposition: Again, I would demand, whether if this ground be false which is supposed as true, by him: That all Idolatry implies a plurality of Gods worshiped; He that worships one false God may not be said to be an Idolater? I see no reason to doubt but he that held there was any such thing in the world, would, and must yield to the Affirmative, *viz.* That it is, supposing that there is Idolatry not consisting in more Gods than one. Now the Papists do certainly, not only suppose, but hold, that Idolatry may be committed in worshipping one God, who is falsely so called; and therefore though, according to his single *Hypothesis*, they may defend themselves, yet neither according to their own grounds, nor ours. Fourthly, The ground of that his supposition is not to be allowed: For this it is, That divine Adoration re-

ceives its specification from the intention: which is an act principally of the will, so, that be the object what it will, yet if I have no intention to worship any other than the true God, I worship him, when I direct my worship to that which we may suppose not to prove, upon tryal, God: But this is not to be granted, that intention is sufficient to denominate worship, or constitute it true and Catholick; though it suffices abundantly to make a worship false, when it is intended for such: And then may a man be said to intend false worship, not only when he knows it to be false; but when he might possibly know it to be so, and when he intends to worship that which actually is a false object: For, as hath been said, Idolatry consists principally in the understanding; as also the Scripture intimateth, when it charges the Idolatrous *Israelites* with ignorance of God: For were, not the *Samaritans* Idolaters, who knew not the manner of the God of *Israel*? And what saith the Prophet *Isaiah*? *They that make a graven Image [i. e. to worship it] are all of them vanity; and their delectable things shall not profit, and they are their own witnesses, they see not, nor know, that they may be ashamed.* Surely if any man saw, and were convinced of his error, he would be ashamed of it; but 'tis his ignorance, that detains him, as well as precipitates him into such errors; as *St. Paul* witnesses of the *Gentiles*: *Having their understanding darkened through the ignorance that is in them, because of the blindness of their heart.* Fifthly, There is no reason to grant, that simplicity and sincerity of Intention and Resolution of worshipping none but the true God, may not consist and hold good in worshipping more than one God: as in the case of the *Athenians* worshipping the *unknown God* in the *Acts*: For, as *Pausanias* in *Eliack*, taking notice of this inscription, hath it: *The Persians* threatening *Greece* with War, the *Athenians* sent to the *Lacedemonians* to beg aid of them: *Pan* met their Embassador *Philippides*, and expostulated with him, why the *Athenians* had made no statue to him, but left him out? adding that if they received him, he would stand by them; Hereupon they erected this Monument, *To the unknown God.* Others say, That they being miserably harrassed with the Pestilence, and finding no relief from them they worshipped, bethought themselves there might be a God neglected by them, who might relieve them, and so dedicated an Altar, *To the unknown God*? Might not all these things stand with very great sincerity of intention? And yet I suppose it was Idolatry: So that sincere resolution and intention of worshipping none but the true God only, may be found, where many are worshipped: For, though to us, as *St. Paul* saith, *\*There is but one God and one Lord*, yet with all Nations, it was not so: they might really and stedfastly believe, there were more Gods than one: And therefore *Tolet* the *Jesuit* well writeth thus: *Therefore Idolatry is the exhibiting of a Divine worship to a false God: For to worship him for true God who is not God, either by praising him, or invoking him, or Sacrificing to him, or any wayes prostrating ourselves to him, is to commit Idolatry* — *False adoration, which is Idolatry, is never but where an Error in the understanding goeth before.* † And besides all this, the Author of this tenet in another place, acknowledges it to be a sort of Idolatry, to feign or device a worship of God, otherwise than was instituted of God, and that not only to worship God out of the verity of Faith, but out of the unity of the Church, containeth in it a worship of another God, than is propounded by the Christian Faith to be worshiped in the Church. — And again, *All commentitious religion propounds such a God*

to

2 King. 17. 26.  
1st. 4. 9.

Ephes. 4. 18.

Act. 17. 23.  
\* *Toletus* In-  
fruct. Sacer-  
dotum. l. 4.  
c. 14. §. 6.  
† *De Ratione*  
et Jure defi-  
niend. pag.  
273.

*Nam ut Super-  
stitionis caput  
est Idololatria;  
ita omnis Dei  
cultus non so-  
lum extra veri-  
tatem fidei, sed  
etiam extra u-  
nitatem Eccle-  
siae, alterius  
Dei cultum in  
se continet ab  
eo, quem Fides  
Christianorum  
communis in-  
tra Ecclesiam  
colendum pro-  
ponit.* —

*— Omnis enim  
Commentitia  
religio talem  
sibi Deum co-  
lendum propo-  
nit, qualem fi-  
dei ipsa com-  
mentum sit; non  
qualem se ipse  
ostendit. Quod  
Idololatriae in-  
staur quoddam  
est.*

to be worshipped as it hath feigned to it self, not as he hath declared himself to be. By which words I understand him to explain himself, and draw nearer to the common notion of Idolatry than he is commonly taken to do: For granting that it is a kind of Idolatry to offer any superstitious worship interdicted by God, and that in thus doing a man doth in effect frame to himself a God distinct from the true God; it may be easily granted that all Idolatry consisteth in *Polytheism* or plurality of Gods; because in effect a man makes strange Gods, though not formally as he that constituteth one of purpose, to worship, as the object of his Devotion.

And this agreeth with what othet learned men have written of Idolatry extending it to a false notion or judgment of the one true God: For, *Erasmus* in his Catechism on the Creed, saith; *Whosoever thinketh otherwise of God than in truth he is, or doth not believe him to be such as the Authority of the Holy Scriptures hath described him to us, believeth not in God but in an Idol.* To the same purpose speaketh *Mr. Perkins* thus: *If adoration be given to the true God with a false and erroneous intention, it makes him an Idol: For example, if the body be bowed with this intent to worship God out of the Trinity, as the Turk doth: Or, if he be worshipped out of his Son, with the Jews, thus doing we worship not the true God, but an Idol.* To these I add these words of *Luther*: *All manner of Religion, let it have never so great a name and lustre of Holiness, when people will serve God without his word and command, is nothing else but plain Idolatry.*

It may be said in behalf of *Jews* and *Turks*, that they are not Idolaters, because they worship God according to the true Light of Nature, asserting and magnifying above all men the unity of God, and directing their worship after the manner of the service of God, before Christ: To which answering, I shall wave the question about the measure of knowledge, the *Jews* had of the Trinity before Christ, of which somewhat hath been said before; and rather distinguish between the manner of their believing or disbelieving those mysteries: For it is much different, Negatively, not to believe them, and Privatively, or contrarily, to believe. The state of Nature, and of the *Jews* might be such before Christ, as not to have the true and clear notion of Christ, as the Son of God, and of the Trinity, and yet not to oppose or directly deny it; as *Jews* and *Turks* at this day: For they have now a contrary Faith unto these; and therefore how they can be excused from Idolatry, according to the favorablest staters of Idolaters, here now mentioned, I cannot see: For they who worship God as he is not, but as he is framed by such mens wits, are a kind of Idolaters: But Christian Faith teaches us that to God, it is essential to be Three in One, and One in Three; which is by all but Christians, I mean *Turks* and *Jews*, absolutely denied: And therefore *Chrysostom* denies the *Jews* worship God.

This likewise prosecuted gives us no small help towards the resolution of that doubt, and reconciling of that contrariety, which seemeth to have been the main motive to the entertaining a new notion of Idolatry, and clearing thereby, the Church of *Rome* from that foul and mortal Imputation: For it being generally granted that the Church of *Rome* is a true Church, it must of force be denied, that it is Idolatrous; because Idolatry is inconsistent with the Nature of a true Church; and destroyeth the Faith in the very foundation.

To

*Quicunque de Deo secus sentit quam revera est, &c. Erasmus. in Symbolum Catechism. 2.*

*Κυρίω τὸν θεὸν ἡμεῖς λατρεύομεν [ἡμεῖς] ἔχον. Epict. cap. 38.*

*Perkins Cases of Conscience. l. 2 c. 11. Luther Collog. Mensalia. p. 91.*

*Οὐδέτις ἵκε- δαῖον προσ- κυνεῖ τὸν θεόν· τίς ταῦτα φησὶν ἢ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ. Ἐπὶ τὸν πατέρα γὰρ μὲν εἰδέναι, καὶ ἐμὲ ἥδυναι αὐτόν, &c. Chrysost. ad Judaizantes. Serm. 27. Tom. 6. pag. 369.*



To which argument very pressing, I confess, I offer this Reply; First, calling to mind the distinction heretofore laid down of a true Church, either in the *Integral* Parts of Christian Doctrine, or *Essential*: We deny the Romane Church to hold all the Integral Parts of the body of Faith; and so not a true Church: We hold also that it retaineth the *Essentials*, and so may be termed a true Church. Again of *Essential* or *Fundamental* points of Faith, we distinguish the *Abstract* sense, and the *Concrete* sense: And affirm, that although in the *Abstract* sense or Proposition, the Church of *Rome* is in many points free from Idolatry; yet taking their doctrines concretely with their practise, interpreting them; they are certainly Idolatrous: But a Church is chiefly to be judged by the article in itself, and not in the unnatural sense appearing in particular practises. The Church of *Rome* holds, That the true God alone is to be worshiped: But if the Sons of that Church notwithstanding worship somewhat besides God, this is a corruption in Fact, and not in Faith: And perhaps the Church being an *Abstract* Body from single Persons; and the Faith from single Practise, the particular errors which are committed there, not flowing necessarily from that general Principle, may not be charged, but in a vulgar sense, upon the Church: But yet, be it so, that the Churches determinations should not oblige men necessarily to Idolatry, the Idolatrous Practises of so many in the worshiping of the *Host*, *Agnus Dei*, *Images*, and *Saints* and *Angels* permitted and countenanced in that Church, were sufficient ground of separation from that Church, without Schismaticalness: But secondly, we are bound here to distinguish of Idolatry; which, as may appear by what is said, admitteth of diverse senses and acceptations and degrees: For, there is an Idolatry which hath quite another object both real and formal, from the true divine object of worship; and that cannot stand with Christianity: And there may be an Idolatry which errs only in the real Object; but retaineth the Formal Object of Worship: The real Object is the thing itself, to which an Act is directed: The Formal Object is the thing under such a Form or Consideration: Now, though the *Romanists* do err (as certainly they do) in the real Object of worship, they profess they own and retain the true formal reason of Worship, in that they designall to the honor of the true God and Christ; and lay that down as a Reason of their worshiping that Object: For, if that be true which *Ruffinus* and Mr. *Mede* affirm, as I conceive it is; *That those* [Christians] *who in Persecution fell away to Gentile Idolatry, became not thereby wholly prophane, unless, at the same time they denied Christ*; much more is it true that they who profess and intend (as they say) ultimately the honor of Christ, in their outward Idolatry; are to be looked upon as belonging *Radically* to Christs Church: The sum therefore of our opinion is this; That we really believe the Romane Church to be Idolatrous, but not to cease thereby to be Christian, unless it declared against Christ. And we believe that more refined sense of Idolatry to be damnable, in it self; but whether by general deprecation of all Sins known and unknown, as also that they (as they profess) do it with *Abimelech*, in the integrity of their heart and with St. *Paul*, fighting against Christ, *Ignorantly*, they may not find mercy, is hard to determine; but tis easie to determine them to be in the way of damnation, who shall fall wilfully after better education and information into those heinous practises: But if they should urge this argument so strongly to me, that I must be forced

*Qui ad Idolatriam devolvitur, non plenè, nec integrè prophanus efficitur, nisi negaverit Christum.* Ruffin. Invektivâ 2. in Hieron. Christians in their Apostasie neither did, nor were to make an absolute Apostasie from God the Father and Christ, but in outward profession still to acknowledge them, and to be called Christians, &c. Mede A. post. p. 66, 67. Gen. 20. 1 Tim. 1. 13.

ced to that which as yet I am not sensible of, *viz.* either to deny the Roman Church to be a true Church, or to deny it to be guilty of Idolatry; I should soon choose to deny the Church of *Rome* to be a true Church of Christ, especially since the late corrupt decisions of what was ambiguous before, and capable of a fair interpretation, for the worst; than deny that to be Idolatry which the principal of their Doctors have taught, and the generality of the People do constantly practise. For, what doth it avail them to confront those foul and notorious dogmes alledged out of their prime Writers making for plain Idolatry, or the instances of gross practises, with showing some tolerable sense quite antiquated, which such Facts, may be done in? Whenas, first, they can give not so much reason why the moderate and favourable construction made should be the sense of their Church, as may be given why it is. Secondly, if it were not so, that some remained in that Church to buoy up, in some manner, the sinking Faith, and stand up for the oppressed truth, they could in no tolerable sense be called a Church at all: But by reason of that small struggling for Life in that Church, they may be termed a Church, out of Charity at least, if not verity. For Charity believeth all things.

*Ego hoc arbitror quod non polluit nomen Domini, nisi ille qui visus est homini ejus credere: et quomodo tollit membra Christi et facit membra meretricis, qui prius Christo credit, sic ille polluit nomen Domini qui prius nominis ejus fidem susceperit. Hieron. in c. 43. Ezech.*

## CHAP. XV.

*Of Idolatry in the Romish Church, in particular, viz. In worshipping Saints, Angels, Reliques, and especially the supposed blood of Christ. No good foundation in Antiquity or the Scriptures for the said Worship.*

**F**ROM what hath passed, may we with greater expedition conclude, what remains of the Object of Worship, and the superstition, even to Idolatry, committed in worshipping of Saints and Angels, not only in themselves, but Reliques: For certainly, Prayer to them, or invocation of them is a proper Act of adoration; no man doubts it: And therefore, see in what degree men pray to them, they worship them, as likewise what outward honor they give them, or their Remains, or Images.

And for the Spirits of just men made perfect, as also their Reliques, really such, we allow due respect, proper for such Objects: But for the Images of Saints we know none proper to them, as not at all belonging to them, no part of them, bearing no relation to them, but as it shall please vain men to appoint it: Yet though we hold no reverence at all is due to the Image of Saints or Angels for their own sakes, or for the sakes of them they represent, yet also hold we it unlawful to offer any indignity to them, unless constrained from the abuses and superstitions used toward them; which when they arrive at that height as to be made objects, mediate

mediate or immediate of religious worship, may lawfully suffer the same fate with the brazen Serpent, in *Hezechiab's* dayes.

But first of Invocation of Saints, in any sense: How can we sufficiently wonder at the uncertainty, yea contradiction of the greatest Patrons of it; Whereof not only some affirm and some deny, but the same Persons sometimes affirm, and sometimes deny any such thing to be required or mentioned in Scripture. *Pighius* and *Cope* give their reason why Saints were not worshipped under the Old Testament, to be; because they were not then partakers of the beautiful Vision, as afterward: And this reason gives *Bellarmin* likewise; yet for all that presums to alledg the words of *Jacob*, *Gen.* 48. very ridiculously. First, because he confessed the Old Testament afforded no Presidents or Precepts for it. Secondly, because those words have quite another Sense than that he would draw them to: I shall therefore cut off all that may be answered to the frivolous allegation of Scripture, in that behalf; as, duly examined, making more suspected of error than point, than confirming it: so very violent is the use of them: And enquire rather first about the manner, and then the reason, and lastly the Authority or Tradition for this, very briefly.

Bellar. de Ba-  
titud. Sanct.  
l. i. c. 19.

Of the three severall distinct wayes wherein we are said to pray unto Saints one is not to pray to Saints, at all; but unto God: For, the first named by learned men, which is *to pray to God that upon intuition, or consideration of Saints worth, or prayers, or intercession he would hear us, doth not* make Saints at all the Object of our prayers; but the subject, or matter of them: which whether convenient to be used or not, is besides our present question, and belonging to another place; and therefore may well be passed over, and rather granted to be lawful and useful than disputed: For certainly, he that petitions a King to grant him any thing for such a Favorites sake, who is about him, and is his friend, doth not thereby petition such a Courtier himself: And this may be proved out of the ancient offices of the Church. A second way is, when we directly pray to them, but not Particularly; supposing they should either particularly understand all that we do, or beg; but by a general Petition desiring that they would pray for us. A Third way is, when we desire of Saints and Angels such things as are proper only to God to give us: As if we should pray unto them to forgive us our sins, to give us grace of mind, and health of Body: But these two do not seem to be distinct kinds, but only differing in extent and matter: For in the first, a man doth make the matter of his request, that they would promote that request which tendeth principally to God; and ultimately. In the second, that they would procure to them the things prayed for; which two differ in degrees, not kind of Invocation.

Again they are wont here also to distinguish of *Civil* worship and *religious*: And of Religious worship again into *Divine* proper, and *improper*: As for the former, I see no reason, how common soever it is, to grant any such thing to Saints or Angels: seeing all the ground of civil reverence given from one to another, as in profession of our service honor and obedience to our Parent, Masters or Governors, wholly dependeth upon our civil, and visible communion with them, and civil Acts passing from one to another; which communion or relation is extinguished quite by their natural death and departure out of this world; as appeareth in the most intimate of all relations between men

in



in this world; which is that of Man and Wife; which Nature, Reason, and the Scripture teach us to be as free, as if they had never met together, or known one another, after the decease of either. And surely all civil relations being founded on flesh and blood, or Nature: the foundation taken away, must also cease and come to nothing: Should a subject ask a Petition of his Sovereign that were alive, but some hundred miles distant, or out of hearing, or of whose capacity to hear his prayers he had no competent assurance, I cannot tell what more to call it, but I am sure, it were very absurd and ridiculous: Now whether the communion of Saints and Angels, which generally is no more than mystical, and not at all civil, or natural with us, be such as doth not wholly render them unsensible of our Acts, though directed to them, here, I at present determine not; but this I may say, that the bond of civil communion is quite broke between us and them, and therefore are all Acts of that nature vain and groundless: So that I may pray any Christian brother to pray for me here, while we hold both civil and religious communion together, but this being built upon that, ceaseth together with that; and becoms no longer of a mixt nature, partly religious, and partly natural or civil, but purely Mystical, and not to be exercised by such mixt acts as Invocation; or outward veneration; there being no known intercourse or reciprocation civil, between us. Therefore of necessity, whoever maintains worship to be given to Saints, must ascribe and defend divine worship to them: and so in expresse terms we find them to do, however they please to mollifie and extenuate the matter before such, as they find startled and impatient, at such plain derogation of Gods honor: But they who openly profess to give Divine honor to Saints, thus state the matter, as doth *Azorius; Heretiques* (saith he) *no wayes deny that Saints are to be honoured with that worship and honor which men eminent for vertue, power, wisdom, nobility, and Authority may be worshipped with: for such honor as this is altogether civil and human; but they tax Catholiques for worshipping them as God; that is, that they give divine honor to them— But how greatly are they mistaken? For Catholiques worship them not as God, but for Gods sake worship and honor them; For as before we said, Catholiques worship not the Image for God, but for Gods sake.* — So in like manner we honor not Saints only with that honor wherewith we honor vertuous, wise, and noble men, but with divine honor and worship which is an Act of Religion — But we give not divine honor to them for their own sakes, but for Gods sake: Thus he. Against which we object sacriledg, and Idolatry, thus loosely delivered: For as for the distinction, it serves their turn nothing at all. It implies with us a contradiction: For to give Divine honor to any Creature is Idolatrous, for what reason, or for whose sake, soever it be given. Neither is it possible a man should give it to a Creature for Gods sake; meaning, as I suppose they do, for the honor of God: For, divine worship being proper to God, and incommunicable to any but him, can no more be given, for his sake to the Creature, than supream honor to a Villain; for the Kings sake: And therefore as he goes on, *to erect Temples and Altars and offer Sacrifices in honor of Saints* (which is to tell us more plainly what they mean by Divine worship) and this (as they say) for Gods sake, is with us Idolatry; who deny that any such things can be done really to Gods honor; and much more that God would have them so honour'd; or himself by them.

And whereas a little before he saith, *It was the Heresy of Eustathius, as So-crates writeth in his History. l. 2. c. 33. That Saints were not to be worshipped,*

N n n

but

*Azor. Instit. Moral. l. 9. c. 10. Quinto, queritur, &c.*

*Minime colit pro Deo, sed propter Deum, &c.*

Socrat. l. 2. c.  
 μβ.  
 Ο πατήρ ὁ  
 σὺς ὁ υἱὸς  
 ἰσὺς θεός.

but God alone, as being against the first Commandment ; There is no such thing to be found in that place ; but this we find, which expresses the dealing of the *Romanists* in this and other controversies, viz. how that *Eudoxius*, being in *Julians* dayes placed in the Episcopal Throne of *Constantinople*, he uttered these words in publique, *God the Father is impious, but God the Son is pious* ; at the hearing whereof the minds of all present being much troubled, and beginning to mutiny, He added : *Let not this saying trouble you : For 'tis true, thus : God the Father is impious because he worshippeth none ; but God the Son is pious, because he worshippeth the Father.* Which being heard, the tumult was appeased, and instead of it, they all fell out into laughter, and so was that saying ever after look'd on, as ridiculous : In like manner, when these new Divines come with great swelling language of divine honor, to be given to the Creature, in their interpreting themselves, they must be very heretical and prophane, or very ridiculous : Or, rather it is both, to say, *We must give divine honor to Saints for Gods sake* : yea an abomination, yet greater, to make God the author of his own injury and degradation ; as it were to set up a competitor to a King against his will, or at least without his will, for his sake.

But, suppose what may not be granted, that there is a favourable interpretation and tolerable practise in the Church of *Rome* of these things ; I am sure this is not tolerable, that such sayings as these, and many more should pass untouched, or uncensur'd by them, yea are kept, and nourished, and preferred much by the most Visible authority of their Church, and the other softer, inferior sense allowed and made use of chiefly to dispute with, and to decline the force of a resolute accuser, and to satisfie green profelytes with, who are not able to digest the stronger and ranker Divinity, they have for them in store when it shall be too late to see the truth ; and must have their mouths stopt, and all objections and scruples answered with this : *The Church cannot err.*

It is most apparent, that God, neither in Old nor New Testament, hath given any such warrant as *Ahasuerus* did to *Haman* to exalt *Mordecai* ; or *Pharaoh* to honor *Joseph* ; for us to honor Saints in exhibiting any thing of divine worship to them. I shall not need therefore trouble this place with their citations to that purpose, which is not to the purpose, when it was there manifest to all, that such honor was the honor not of a King, but a principal subject and Minister of state. Neither do Scriptural reasons advance their cause : Whereof some are so parabolical and forced, that they fall to nothing before they come to us : as that of *Mat. 24. 26.* and that of Saint *Peter* ; *2 Pet. 1. 14, 15.* being plainly intended of the records he would leave with them he wrote to, to bear in memory what he delivered to them ; as *Cajetane* hath noted : And the Power promised *Rev. 2. 26.* to them that overcome, is not (as they violently give out) a power to dispense blessings, and therefore to be sought to by Invocation : but a power to be victorious in the Faith against all persecutions : And those reasons drawn from *Apoc. 5. 8.* and *6. 10.* and *8. 3, 4.* Are all besides the vanity of the form of the argument it self, upon a false foundation and supposition, viz. as if those things there related were acted in Heaven, and not upon earth. True it is (as hath been noted before) that the Vision of the Apostle is implied to have been in Heaven concerning things there revealed to him ; but it was of things only to be fulfilled on earth. And though it is most easie, fit, and obvious to interpret the *Angel* offering incense, as the fervent prayers of the holy Saints upon earth

earth to God the Father ; yet it is, I conceive, more literal and agreeable to the intent of the Revelations made, to interpret them partly as descriptions of things *doing then* in the Church, and partly as prophecies of the future condition of the Church, in the publique Service of God ; where, by the *Angel* we are to understand the *Bishop*, who in the first dayes of the Church was wont in presence and behalf of the people to offer up the common prayers of the People at the golden Altar, *viz.* The special place of his ministrations; which prayers and worship did, like incense, ascend unto the holy Throne of God : And the fire which is said to be cast from the Censer and Altar unto the earth, is nothing else but the fervent prayers of the Saints offered by their Minister to God ; for his favor against them on the earth, which so miserably persecuted and oppressed the Christians : upon which Gods judgments fell on the earth, after the manner of voices and thunderings and lightnings and earthquakes. But *Eccius* and *Cope* gives us a Reason why the Apostles left no precept or directions to us in the new Testament to give the worship, now pleaded for as due to Saints, *viz.* lest it might seem a piece of arrogance in them to seek such honor: Well, be this reason true or false, it matters not; it seems plainly by this, no such thing is to be found in the New Testament, and this suffices us against them.

Let us next briefly enquire, What prescription from Antiquity they have for it. Where we find not one cited by them but *Irenæus* ; who, as the *Latin* edition only extant hath it, calls the blessed Virgin the *Advocate* of *Eve* ; meaning no more, as hath been soundly replied by others, than the *Greek* word *παράκλητος* may import which is Comforter : so that as *Eve*, by her sin was an occasion of Mans fall, the Virgin *Mary* by bearing Christ, restored that loss : Not meaning any personal intercession: For, *Dionysius* the *Areopagite*, we make no reckoning of him : *Athanasius* is cited too but falsely in a spurious work: So that till the year 250 we find no mention of Prayers to Saints; though men were wont to put up their devotions before that time, at the Monuments of Saints and Martyrs ; and did pray for the deceased. *Nazianzen*, *Basil* and *Chrysostom* do now and then, once or twice in their great and many treatises intimate such a thing but as an extraordinary thing. And *Ambrose*, who knew little but what he transcribed from them, and *Origen* and *Hilary*, took the hint from them, and first mentioned it in the *Latin* Church : For, though *Cyprian*, and *Cornelius*, and *Hilary* be cited to this purpose, They only affirm that Saints intercede for us, which indeed was made a ground of our invocation of them afterward, but it was not to do it ; and they only desired God for their sakes, which is not to desire them. And it was not until the Council of *Nice* 300 years and upward that the opinion of a particular intercession of Saints for us prevail'd in any measure : Nor till many years after that, became it a common practise: And above 1200 years passed since Christ, before it broke out into that excess, that now it is commended unto us by the Church of *Rome* : And in very late dayes hath found such stout and direct opposition from the wiser and learned men, that the common practise hath been taxed of flat Idolatry, witness *Ludovicus Vives* and *Erasmus*. These things are we are sure of: First, God no where requires it: Secondly, We offend not in omitting it: And, Thirdly, That God is notoriously dishonoured by the use of it amongst Christians: But *Cassander* doth in very few words answer what may be alledged out of Fathers writings or ancientest Liturgies,



*Omnes Sancti  
Deum orate  
pro me, ac si  
dicatur Utinam  
omnes Sancti  
Deum orent pro  
me! Quam ve-  
lim, ut omnes  
Sancti Dei or-  
rent pro me.  
&c. Cassand.  
Scholio in  
hymnos Ec-  
clesiast. pag.  
242.*

(for it was a long time after private pens had uttered somewhat tending that way, that any place could be granted such Forms in the Liturgy in the Church) in behalf of invocation of Saints. *When it is there said (saith he) All Saints O pray ye for me, it is no more than, O that all the Saints would pray for me: How could I wish that all the Saints would pray for me.* But now alas no such benign interpretation will be accepted.

To the contrary, we are able to produce much more probable texts of Scripture, than are yet found there for this worship; and more express sentences of the Ancients against, than can be brought for it; but it were to exceed bounds to bring them in here. Our reason likewise from Scripture they have not yet answer'd, That God and Christ frequently invite us to come unto them, and no where to use such intercessors: And, that it is against the sufficiency of our own Mediator Christ: To which they answering, That Christ is the sole mediator of Redemption, but not of Intercession, do shew neither good Philosophy nor Divinity: For Christ intercedes for us chiefly by the Redemption he hath made for us; when he satisfied our debt, and purchased Gods favor, by his Death and Passion; and these are they that make intercession for us. Intercession, I know, is of a larger extent, and implies Acts of application of that general Redemption, which notwithstanding doth not justify the distinction, being of Subordinates.

I know there are found some learned Moderators on our side, who have attempted to compound this matter, by changing *Invocation*, which seems peculiar to God in all proper senses, into *Advocation*, and *Compellation* of Saints; meaning by this latter, the same with that Civil Invocation, advice, or exhortation before mentioned; and stating the question so, that then it should be only a Calling to Saints rather than upon them; but the argument of all civil Communion, and Communication either immediately by our selves or mediately by others, being wholly dissolved and extinct, at their departure out of this life, being yet for ought we know not answer'd; and all such compellation being a civil and humanely sociable act, quite overthrows that supposition and imagination: And this must needs offend against the Rule of the Apostle, condemning such as *intrude into things they have not seen, vainly puff'd up in their fleshly mind*: For the assurance of the object of our prayers is essential unto prayer, however the matter may be uncertain; as when prayer is made for the dead, which was very ancient, we may innocently err in the matter for want of Scriptural information and reason, but keeping still entirely to the Object, God; our error must needs be on the right hand: But framing to our selves a groundless, and uncertain Object, we must needs corrupt the holy duty of prayer much more. If the Saints and Angels do know what are our thoughts, (as they must, our voice conducting little or nothing to the making them capable of our meanings at that distance of place and condition they are in) it is more than we can possibly know; and so in a manner as much as if it were not at all, to us: If they have such Charity as is pretended, greater much than is to be found in holy men on earth, (which is most probable) yet that it is greater to us, or to one man above another, as it was upon earth, I believe not: For all Affections being founded (I do not say managed) upon carnal or fleshly nature, ceaseth with the body; and the Charity being clearly illuminated and directed infallibly by their knowledge or vision, so as it was not here, cannot be exercised but according to that Light, and that Rule  
given

Guiliel. Forbes modesta  
Consider.

Col. 2. 19.

given them, which is the will of God; which perceiving so fully, and in which being so absolutely satisfied, they cannot be said to pray that it might be done, so much as admire, and continually adore the doing of it; without interposing, by way of particular intercession as we out of ignorance do here on earth, for the inclining or averting of God from any thing they see in him future, or rather present. They have therefore indeed greater Charity as to the purity and intenseness of it, which is Charity Triumphant, but not Militant, according to which last only they are said to assist us by their prayers: And, yet this I may add, That as the intercession of Saints in Heaven for us is no wayes to be allowed to be vocal or proper, as on earth, nor by any special act direct to God on the behalf of their Friends and Fellow-members on earth, for the reason now given; so may they not be denied all influence upon God in his dispensation of grace and benefits to us on earth; as God doth please to consider their Labor of Love not only for themselves, but fellow-members here below.

And whereas one of the best testimonies alledged to prove special offices of Angels done before God in behalf of the Militant Members of Christ here, is taken out of the Revelation, where S. John prayeth, or saluteth rather with a Pastoral and Apostolical benediction the seven Churches of Asia saying, *Grace be unto you and peace from him, which is, and which was, and which is to come, and from the seven spirits, which are before his Throne*: It may sufficiently be answered, with that of Tobit c. 12, 15. where mention is made of *Seven Angels before the Throne*, (were this authority greater with us, than it is) That we doubt not but God doth make use of the Ministry of Angels to impart his blessings to men on earth: For, this implies the benediction of Jacob, given to Joseph, *The Angel which redeemed me from all evil bless the Lads*: but this infers not either that Jacob did then, or we should now address our selves to Angels; but as he certainly there, so ought we to seek of God only, that he would by his servants the holy Angels, preserve and bless us. Nevertheless, I, according to my former Rule interpret the seven spirits in the Revelation to be none other than the seven Governors or Bishops of the seven Churches, of which St. John speaks immediately before: whom in a Vision St. John saw to stand before the golden Altar, or proper place of worship; and from thence blessing the people. But no more of this.

Agreeable to this is the doctrine of making Images and Reliques of Saints objects of divine worship too, and that though not for their own sakes, yet for Gods sake: to which I need say no more than is already spoken of so worshipping Saints.

But for their sakes who can be content with less honor done unto them, it may suffice to say in few words, what Cassander hath observed before me: *It is certain that at the beginning of the preaching of the Gospel for a good time, especially in Churches, there was no use of Images at all, as Clemens and Arnobius witness*: And this was above two hundred years after Christ: Afterward Pictures were admitted into Churches with great simplicity and innocency, yea benefit to the vulgar Christian, whose book Gregory not unfitly called them, as expressing the historical part of Christian Faith, and no more worshipped then, than *Papists* worship their Bibles now: And that Images should be erected at all, or being constituted that they should be worshipped at all, or brought into Temples, there was never any admirer or adorer of them could pretend to show out of

Scripture.

Rev. 4.

Tobit. 12. 15.

Gen. 48. 16.

Azorius ubi sup.

Cassan. Consult.

Scripture. But the second commandment against all Images in order to worship or reverence, hath prov'd such a bone, that it hath broke the teeth of all that would break it: *Erasmus* in his Catechism stateth the cause thus: *Before the coming of Christ, when the Israelites were very rude and dull, all Imagery was prohibited them, for fear of Idolatry: But now since all Paganism is extinguished by the Light of the Gospel, the danger is not the same, and if any superstition should lurk still in the minds of Christians, it may easily be driven thence by holy Doctrine. Until the age of St. Hierom were certain men of sound Religion which would endure no Images at all in Churches, either painted, or graven, or wrought, no not of Christ: I suppose, by reason of the Anthropomorphites: yet by little and little (Where are they then that with so much importunity and little reason call for the very time precisely wherein corruptions entered into the Church; or else will not be satisfied?) the use of Images entred into Churches: And perhaps there would be no undecency, if in such places as God is served in solemnly no images should be placed, saving the Image of Christ crucified: But Pictures if they were duly used, besides the honest pleasure they bring, conduce very much to memory and understanding of history—Tea the learned many times see more in Pictures than Letters; and are more vehemently affected: And as the Ancient Church prohibited all books, not canonical, to be used in Churches, so perhaps were it not amiss, if all kinds of Pictures of things not contained in Holy Scripture were excluded. To this effect and almost in these very words he: To which we must so far assent, as to yield a possible good effect of Information and Devotion arising from such outward occasions as Pictures, yet considering, God hath no where laid any obligation upon us to profit by such helps, as he hath to advance our selves in knowledge and Christian virtues by consulting Holy Scriptures, and how great and manifest peril of falling into Idolatry by them, there is; it were more pious and safe to interdict the falling down before, as well as to them: man being naturally as prone to Idolatry as to unlawful carnal copulation.*

But whereas *Erasmus* proceedeth to defend Images, because God in the Old Law commanded to make *Cherubins* and *Seraphins* about the Ark, *Tertullian* answereth, *That so may we too when we have the like command: For though God ties us up strictly to his Laws, he doth not so tye himself, but when he pleases he may give us a dispensation: But besides this, such Images were altogether hid from the peoples eyes, and much more, use; being in the Holiest of Holies: and we speak now of such as are exposed to view and reverence: And as common as this instance is, amongst the great Doctors of Rome, it makes little to their purpose. Again, Erasmus; That which is before God [meaning that, *Thou shalt have no other God before me*] is made equal to God. There is no necessity of this, and yet may be unlawful by vertue of that Precept: For (saith he) nothing void of Reason is capable of adoration, that is, Veneration external, nor worship that is, Internal Veneration: And when he saith, If a man kifs the Crucifix without superstition, he offendeth not; but as the Case standeth now a dayes, and as worship is described by Romish Authors, and as they expound the definitions of their Councils upon this subject, it cannot be done without superstition: And himself seems to be of my mind in these words following, *That Images should be in Churches, no human order requires: And as it is easier, it is safer also to take away all Images out of Churches, than to prevail that no excess should be committed, nor superstition mingled therewith.**

And



And how dull and damnable superstition is constantly committed, yea publicly tolerated, yea, countenanced and encouraged in the use of Images, I could easily and undeniably evidence, were it my business: For, however I am not ignorant there is a wariar and soberer sense given of the use of Images, yet this is chiefly in the ears of such as will not be gained to them, but by drawing the sense current of that Church with a fairer face; but this we find in their writings, *It is the common opinion of Divines, Imagines in eodem honore, &c. That the Image is to be worshipped and honoured with the same worship and honor wherewith the thing it self is to be worshipped*: And he that sayes this should know the mind of that Church as well as any other; and the rather because he hath many of the same mind with himself: *Thomas* the Great leading them.

But I had almost forgotten the mad, or merry conceit of *Baronius* to draw Image worship from Gods own institution; He says, *God appointed the use of Images by Peters shadow, whereby he cured sick persons*. I marvel much (seeing such great use might be made of it) that among so many rare and curious Reliques of Saints retrieved, or secured perpetually by the Church of *Rome*, they could never happen upon a limb of the shadow of *St. Peter*, whereby sick folk were cured; to be shown for Images, and worshipped: For, until that, I shall not trouble my self to answer *Baronius* his argument for them, and then I will profess, I cannot.

Now for the ancient use of Images, it is certain, out of *St. Austin* quoting *Varro* to that purpose, that the Heathen Romans had no Images, which they worshipped for the space of an hundred and seventy years; and that *Varro's* opinion was, that the Gods were more purely worshipped before the use of Images was introduced, then afterwards: And it is evident that until *Origens* dayes Christians made no religious use of Images: And in *Gregory* the Great his dayes, who commended Images in some sense, they were prohibited, and that by himself, as objects of worship, though not as helps; which Bishop *Latimer* approved in this manner: *Images of Saints are called Saints, and so are not to be worshipped, taking worshipping of them for praying to them: For they are neither Mediators, by way of Redemption nor yet of Intercession. And yet they may be well used, when they may be applyed to that use they were first ordained for: to be Laymens books for remembrance of heavenly things*. About the year 700 unto the year 800 of Christ, many and bitter contentions arose amongst the *Grecians* concerning the use of Images, then receiving another construction than former ages approved of: Many turns happened for, and against them; till at length, that ambitious and unnatural Beast *Irene*, who put out her own son *Constantines* eyes for standing up for his right upon which he died; and then to fortifie her self, took in with the *Popes* Faction of the West, and calling that numerous, but sacrilegious Synod, called the second of *Nice*, concluded the point for ever: after; and so grossly, That *Charles* the Emperor in a Synod of the West-Bishops, when the *Popes* Legates were also present, condemned their decisions about Images. Which hath so galled the greatest defenders of them, that it is a pitiful thing to see what shifts and evasions directly false in themselves, and contradictory one to another, are invented by them. The most current is, that the Synod of *Francfort* mistook the meaning of them at *Nice*; and this surely, for no good end, is received by some of the Reformation as *Grotius* who was the first, that was not of that Church, who could flatter the Church of *Rome* so far as to accept that answer for good; Another of our Church

Azor. Instit.  
Mor. l. 9. c. 6.  
Thomas Sum.  
Par. 3. Quest.  
25. artic. 3.

Baron. Ann.  
34. S. 275.

Aug. Civit.  
Dei.

Origen. cont.  
Celsum. l. 5. p.  
255. & l. 7. p.  
374.  
See Fox A&  
Mon. Vol. 3. p  
464.

Church of no less knowledg in divinity hath since him, I cannot say from him, owned that excuse; but by their leaves upon very ill advice, and no sufficient grounds at all, as I could make appear; but there needs nothing more, though much more might be said, than the Incredibleness of the thing it self, that so many of them should not be able to understand the meaning of that Synod of *Nice*, which spake plain enough, that they worshipped the Image, not for its own matter and form, but for its sake which it represented: But neither did this Synod decree so grossly, as is commonly taught and practised by the Church of *Rome*, which though diverse in it of late dayes do condemn for Idolatrous in that point; some of late among us would have spared, for no other reason than that, by all means, and as it should seem, in all senses, they must be maintained a true Church, the latter of which is as stoutly denied as affirmed; and more easily proved.

Rainold. de  
Roman. Ec-  
cles. Idolat. l.  
1. c. 9. §. 1.

And that from another head, *viz.* Their opinion and use of Reliques; Concerning which, *We* (as Dr. *Rainolds* hath observed) *all agree that honor is due unto the bodies of Saints, yea even the Calvinists*; and this especially in decent interment of them: And upon certain and well grounded information of any Relique of Saints or Martyrs Body found, with all civil respect we commit it to its proper place: or reserve it in much esteem: But what that esteem ought to be, may be, and much is controverted: This the Church of *Rome* saith conformable to their doctrine of Images, that the supposed Parts of Saints are no less to be worshipped then the Saints to whom they belong; and that any Part of Christs garment, and especially his Cross, is capable of divine worship; as that which received, we know not what, divine vertue from thence: And lastly that the blood of Christ shown in many places and believed to be such, is to be adored with the same worship that Christ himself is. And here we may convict them of flat Idolatry, out of their own confessions, supposing this to be Idolatry which themselves grant to be so, *viz.* *To worship that as God which is not God*: For first, this is most generally believed by the Church of *Rome*, that they have many small Remains of the blood of Christ: Next it is generally believed and required, that Divine worship is to be given unto that blood in like manner as to Christ: Now that this reputed blood of Christ, is not really the blood of Christ, not we only, but the learner of themselves teach directly, yea *Thomas* proves it cannot possibly be, because all the blood that was shed from Christs body must of necessity be recollected; and so was miraculously restored to his body again; otherwise Christ had not risen again in that integrity of his human nature, that he suffered in: But it is manifest saith *Thomas*, That flesh, bones, and blood are pertaining to the human nature of Christ, and therefore must all rise perfectly with him: Now, because the scruple is obvious to all, Whence that reputed blood presented solemnly as the very blood of Christ, should proceed, if not from Christs body, from whence we hear it cannot come? He answers thus; *That blood which in some Churches is preserved in Reliques [of his] did not flow from Christs side; but is affirmed to have flown miraculously from a certain Image of Christ which was smitten.* Thus he: And I could give an account of diverse Images, which, according to their own writers, having been so smitten by spiteful Jews, have bled in this manner: And is it not as plain as can be, that this is not Christs blood? And if it be not Christs blood, is it not also as evident that Idolatry is committed, when divine adoration is given

Thomas Sum.  
3. Qu. 54. 2.  
corp. & ad  
3.

ven to it? I make no doubt but there are innumerable in the Church of *Rome*, who have more Faith and knowledg than to throw themselves thus heedlessly into such precipices of Superstition, as are to be found there: And therefore *Grotius* his design of a Reconciliation with the Church of *Rome*, quite overthrown as he imagineth by holding it Idolatrous; was not well laid: For, he that affirms that the Church of *Rome* is Idolatrous, doth not say that all who hold communion with the Church of *Rome* are Idolaters, as he supposeth: Though they hold it unlawful, upon peril, if not of personal guilt of Idolatry very hardly to be avoided there, of *Communicative* Idolatry: which all true Christians ought to shun with greatest care and resolution.

Animad. in  
Animad. Ri-  
vet. Artic. 21.

## CHAP. XVI.

*Of the Fourth thing wherein the Worship of God consisteth, viz. Preaching. How far it is necessary to the Service of God. What is true Preaching. Of the Preaching of Christ, wherein it consisteth. Of Painful Preaching. That the Ministry, according to the Church of England, is much more Painful than that of Sectaries. The negligence of some in their Duty, contrary to the Rule and Mind of the Church, not to be imputed to the Church; but to particular Persons in Authority.*

**W**E come now to speak of the Fifth General, wherein the exercise of Gods worship consisteth, and that is *Preaching*, of which having so far already treated as to make discovery of the great error of Sectaries about it; and the sacrilegious abuse of the true and proper Worship of God, by Idolizing a Sermon, and making the House of God, and all acts of Religion, void, in comparison of it; we may be here briefer in what remains of that subject: For, we find an opinion too prevalent amongst Christians which not only overthroweth the worship of God for Preachings sake; but which is more to be wonder'd at, overthroweth Preaching too, for the Sermons sake: For to that Superstition are they arrived in their opinions of teaching and hearing; that if it be not performed without book, if not out of the Pulpit, if not a text formally taken out of the Bible, If this text be not reduced to Doctrine and Use: If there be not a formal (I do not mean a Form of) Prayer before, and after it, with the common sort, it scarce de-

O o o

serves



Acts. 13. 15.

1 Cor. 14. 29,  
30.

1 Cor. 14. 35.

serves the name of Preaching : And when all those conditions concur, it is not only Preaching and a Sermon indeed, but the Word of God without more ado ; and accordingly to be revered and valued : And it were to be wish'd that were all, and the Scriptures themselves not esteemed, or not much listen'd to, in comparison of them. *Thomas Cartwright* the Great Church-wright (as I may so call him) of Schismatiques, hath expressly affirm'd, That the Scriptures avail little unless expounded, [by themselves surely] and yet they also hold an opinion, which no man can reconcile to this, that the Scriptures contain all things necessary to Salvation, and that plainly ; but let that go : And let us know how a Sermon in its formalities now mentioned, became the Word of God ; and in what sense, and in what age, and by what authority ? It is more than probable that Christ and his Apostles seldom used a Prayer before, or after their Preaching. It is most apparent out of *Justine Martyrs* second apology, and *Tertullians* Apologeticque, that Preaching was used in their publique Assemblies ; and that principally as subservient to Prayer and Communicating, and not set to domineer over them, and be made the chief of Gods worship : And so long as their Prayers were unprescribed, was Preaching unstudied for, and extemporary chiefly ; according to the manner insinuated in the Acts of the Apostles, where it is said : *After the reading of the Law and Prophets the Rulers of the Synagogue sent unto them (Paul and his company) saying, Ye men and Brethren, If ye have any word of Exhortation for the People say on :* And by St. Paul to the Corinthians, laying ; *Let the Prophets speak two or three, and let the rest judge : If any thing be revealed to another that sitteth by, let the first hold his Peace.* These speeches were after the President of the Jewish Assembly had either himself read, or caused the Law to be read, and never without leave first obtained from him : Which custom was for some time imitated by Christians : When the Bishop only first spake to the people, and then by his leave some other began an Exhortation to the People : But this bringing certain inconveniences into Christian Assemblies, in tract of time quite ceased ; and nothing was said but by the Bishop himself ; and that not every time, much less in every place where Christians assembled to the Service of God ; there being for a long time after Christians were multiplied and spread far, not above one Sermon in a Diocese ; and that in the Principal City of that Country : whither people, that had a mind to hear a Sermon or communicate, resorted for the good of their souls, as men do now a dayes to Market, for the food of their bodies. Which being there purchased, the faithful Christian carried it home to his Family, and dispensed to it of the same : following herein the Counsel of St. Paul, that women should ask their husbands, and learn at home. And St. *Chrysostom* often exhorts his hearers to consider of what they hear in publique, at home, and meditate of the Scriptures at home : which was either privately with every mans self, or to such as could not have access to the Publique.

And this publique way of Preaching had for a long time no prescribed subject, but what the Bishop thought proper or seasonable for instruction or Exhortation, was uttered by him : But in Saint *Basil*, *Nazianzen*, *Chrysostoms*, and *Augustines* Sermons we find mention made of the Scriptures read before ; and Sermons made by way of Exposition of them ; after the manner that Epistles and Gospels are in use with us, and commended as proper subjects, to instruct Christian People ; the one giving us  
matter

matter of Instruction from the history of the Life, Doctrine, Miracles, and Death of our only Saviour Christ; and the other, principally moving us to the exercise of all Christians Graces and Vertues, conformable to our calling and knowledg of God and Christ.

Far were our Christian Ancestors (and well they might) from the modern perswasion of Erratick Christians, that the Sermon was more necessary than the Scriptures; or that reading of the Scriptures was not Preaching, or that Catechizing and instructing Novices in Christian Religion, was not Preaching. I confess, I am of opinion, that there is a distinction to be made between a *Preaching* and a *Sermon*; taking here a *Sermon* for an Oration made by un-Christian, as well as Christian Orators, to inform and perswade to what they aimed at, in such speeches. And no instance can be given of any Orator Gentile or Christian for many hundred years, that presumed to speak to the People out of his own writings rehearsed to them (Poets were wont in Publique to recite their verses in Publique out of their book) by reading; and therefore could never in my judgment comply with the very modern practise of it; there being no reason why it should be more tolerated in Divine than Humane Orations; or why, setting the custome of the place aside, (which must needs be corrupt and absurd, as it is singular and new) it is less ridiculous to rehearse a Divine Oration which we call a Sermon, by reading, than Humane. I am sure the ancient Fathers whom we pretend to imitate, and all modern Churches without exception of any, but our own, abhor it: And are not at all sensible of the vulgar arguments weight to justify it, *viz. because the matter is the same, And what difference is there between a Sermon deliver'd without reading, and with it; if the hearer sees him not or looks not on him that Preaches.* But it is very expedient the Hearers eye should be attent, as well as his ear; and yet that is not all might be said neither, but all I will here say.

But undoubtedly they err egregiously on the other hand, who imagine such sermoning as we now speak of, is only Preaching, according to the mind of the Apostle; and that which is the only proper means of Salvation: We are not saved but by Faith, we cannot believe but by hearing, we cannot hear without a Preacher; as the Apostle, most undeniably, concluding from thence the absolute necessity of Preaching: But what Preaching? When I said Recitation of a Speech concerning divine matters and our Salvation, was not properly a Sermon or Oration, unless pronounced after the universal Law of all Orators: (which is to denominate things aright) I said not that it was not Preaching; taking preaching from the end of it, and not so much from the form. The end is undoubtedly, knowledg, first, of the Christian Faith: The next end, is Assent to that Doctrine of Faith: The third end is, Obedience to the Faith: The last end is, the Salvation of such a true believer: Now all these may, without doubt, be obtained without the Forms of Oratory; and by so many wayes as we are made capable of these great ends, so many wayes are we preacht to: And therefore, reading to, and writing to another (as the Apostles did their Epistles to several Churches,) or any communication may be called the word of God and Preaching, as really as the most Oratorical Sermon: Though still, considering the nature of man, and the ordinary course of perswading, settled all the world over, I cannot grant that such wayes are so effectual or operative upon the partakers of the same instructions.

By what is said, may be gathered what I propounded at first, *viz.* in what sense Preaching and Hearing may be reduced to the Worshipping of God, and become part of his Service: For, taking the service of God strictly and properly, neither of both of them are such; but they are a necessary foundation to build our worship of God on. They have of late dayes amongst Sectaries, been called, *The Means*, in so high and signal sense, as if they need say no more, and they comprehended all Religious acts eminently, which is nothing so. They are indeed, *The Means*, and that of Faith, worship, and Salvation: But worshipping of God in prayer, and praises, &c. and obeying his will, and living godly and soberly in this present world, are much more effectual and excellent Means of our Salvation than they. They are but *Means* to the more excellent *means* of Salvation, as Faith, Hope, and Charity: and therefore must know their place, and keep their distance, and their limits too: For, as an excellent person hath at large shewed, the vain abuse of this preaching by *Presbyterians*: (which shall cause me to contract here) *Preaching is not so much as the Means of Salvation, unless it contains it self within the limits of the doctrine of the Church*: To the confirmation of whose opinion I shall here give *St. Austins* Judgment, who would have not only limits set to the matter, but manner of preaching too, by obliging to the phrase of the Church, saying: *We Christians must speak by certain Rule: lest by a License taken of wording it, a wicked opinion be begot of the things themselves signified thereby*. And concerning this we know *St. Paul* hath thus provided, in his directions to *Timothy*: *Hold fast the Form of sound words which thou hast heard of me, in Faith and Love which is in Christ Jesus*: It was very well known to the ancient Church, that if Preachers kept not themselves in the compass of sober words and phrases, to which faithful ears had been accustomed, though their new Forms and phantastique phrases might possibly admit of a fair construction, yet naturally they tended to the disquieting of mens minds from the truth, and drawing them to novelty of doctrine and worship. By which means, as also by affected postures, gestures, pronunciation, and such like carrying with them an outward shew of self denial and preaching Christ in sincerity; Christ is no less deserved, Religion no less endangered, and men no less preach themselves (as they say) than they who with much ambition of honor, profit and applause debauch the noble and Majestick Simplicity of the Gospel, and preaching of Christ, with the vain and impertinent mixture of human learning and eloquence; the difference is only in this, that the one hath his end, the making of the Common people; the other, the making of the Court, and they perhaps somewhat worse than these; from whence they suck no small advantage. Much and high talk there hath been of late about *Preaching of Christ*: And scarce any body hath been thought worthy to be accounted such a Preacher, who hath not first layd aside modesty, manners, civility, prudence and gravity, and flown out into certain exoticque tones, actions, and barbarous demeanures unworthy of a man; which Christ, nor his Apostles, nor Apostolical persons after them, never taught nor practised themselves; never required of them; but have been taken up to serve their own turns, rather than Gods; and hath been a direct preaching themselves as any they could ever instance in, on the contrary side. There are two things surely wherein generally consisteth the preaching of Christ: Sober and sincere manner of composing a mans self to that

Great

Mr. Thorndyck  
Epilog. l. 3.  
c. 25.

Nobis autem  
ad certam re-  
gulam loqui fas  
est, ne verbo-  
rum licentia e-  
tiam rebus que  
his significan-  
tur impiam gignat opinionem.  
Aug. Civit.  
Dei l. 10. c.  
23.



Great work, and the matter he is to treat of; according to which latter, Mr. Perkins well noteth, four things to be requisite, *First, Generally to teach the doctrine of the Incarnation of Christ; and of his three Offices, his Kingly Office, his Prophetical Office, and his Priesthood, with the execution thereof.* This, in good earnest, is so much Preaching of Christ, that scarce any thing else is meant in Holy Scriptures, where it speaks so much of Preaching of Christ; they ayming chiefly thereby at the manifestation of Christ, as the true *Messias* promised of Old; and then come into the world: What is said above this, is, or may be true, but somewhat besides the Letter of the Scripture. *Secondly, to teach that Faith is an Instrument ordained of God to apprehend and apply Christ with his benefits.* Which is very true in the signification of Faith common, in Scriptures, viz. as it is taken for that Complex Evangelical Grace, comprehending all particular Christian vertues and Graces springing from that Head; but not so, as Faith signifies now adayes, a single Grace contradistinct to others. *Thirdly, To certifie and reveal to every hearer that it is the will of God to save him by Christ, in particular, so he will receive Christ,* — 1 John. 1. 11. It were to be wished, this Author had kept closer to this opinion here expressed. *Fourthly, to certifie and to reveal to every particular hearer that he is to apply Christ with his benefits to himself in particular, and that effectually, by his Faith.* Grant we now that this is to preach Christ; yet that this must be done in such unnatural and uncouth manner both of Speech and Gestures as are no less than ridiculous, we must not grant; this is for them who affect and use it, to preach themselves. Again, this preaching of Christ, or hearing of Christ thus preached, is not Worshipping of God, as it hath been mistaken grossely to have been. The reading of the word of God was ever looked upon as a necessary part of the service of God, amongst Jews of Old, and Christians to this day: Believers thereby declaring their Faith towards God, no small act of serving God: But the Sermons of men since the Apostles, never till this superstitious age, were advanced to that esteem or dignity: For, no man can, without derogation from the Scriptures, call them, though sound and Scriptural, the *word of God*; but with limitations. Well, saith a learned and grave Preacher; *However the whole Sermon is the ordinance of God, the whole Sermon is not the word of God*; meaning that it is the Precept of God, that Christian people should be taught, by those that have the spiritual care and tuition of their Souls; but that, what is taught is not worthy of the glorious title of the word of God, no though it be very agreeable unto it. It may much more properly be said to be the will of God than the word of God.

But what falls short in the nature, they hope to make up in the measure of their Worship. And therefore frequentation of Sermons, and painful preaching (as they call it) must, and doth carry it from all other Pretensions to the true Service of God; and those they traduce with the reproach of a lazy Ministry, must without farther dispute yield to be reformed by them, and to their modes too. And truly, Industry and painfulness are such undeniable vertues in all Moral and Civil matters, that no man can object against; no man but must commend: And in spiritual matters often arise to the nature of divine Graces, which are rewardable with proportionable glory; when the Great Lord of us all shall take an account of every servants improving his *Talent*, and to the fruitful, say, *Well done thou good and faithful Servant; Thou hast been faithful in a little, be thou*

Perkins on  
Gal. Col. 1. v. 15,  
16.

Dr. Donne  
Serm. 33. on  
Whitsunday.

*thou ruler over much.* But what is all this, and more which may be added to the nature of the work it self, which God requires at our hands, as our bounden service: as a man may do a good thing negligently, so he may do an ill thing diligently, and industriously: We are now enquiring whether Preaching be worshipping God, or God is served principally by it: If it be, then no doubt but diligence therein is the more commendable: But if it be not, as we have shewed it is not, then our diligence were better placed elsewhere, namely on that wherein consisteth more formally the worship of God, which is prayer. But what if after all this cry of Laboriousness on their side rather than on their Adversaries part, their Ministry is the lazy Ministry rather than ours, as in truth it is? I compare not here Persons which would be infinite; but Religions: and the manner of Ministration and worship constituted by the Church of *England*, and that of any Sect whatever. Let them tell which Religion requires most vigilance, attendance, and pains: That which prescribes every Parish-Priest to officiate three dayes in a week, and propounds dayly Ministration in the Publique place of worship, or that which sets men free all the week unless on the Lords day: That which prescribes so strictly visiting the sick upon all occasion, or that which is maintain'd chiefly by their Minister visiting the Well, and gutling from house to house amongst their favourers and benefactors of their Faction: That which observes or commands the observation of constant Fasts, or that which derides them, and accuses them contrary to all Examples of former Churches, of Superstition: That Religion which requires a punctual observation of that Liturgy, which they profess to be grievous to them, not only because it is a Liturgy prescribed, but because it is too long, and painful: or that which prayes, what it pleases, and as long, and short as it pleases; and with what lazy, crude matter it pleases, never more troubling themselves or being solicitous what or how they shall pray extemporary, than he is, or needs be that reads all out of the book: And surely it is less trouble thus to pray without book, than with it; to any man that will give his mind to it, or will boldly enough offer at it. And for their Sermons, what have they in them to commend them for elaborate, or the Speaker of them, for laborious? Have they not fallen into admiration of one kind of order, and method in preaching, and which with so much Superstition they cleave to, as neither to care nor dare to vary; that half their Sermons are made before they begin? For the Form they have constantly by them, and that shall serve for all texts, and occasions whatever, and that brings the matter in naturally almost; and so neither their invention, nor memory are so pained or hard put to it, that they should need to boast much of their painful Preaching: Surely then, it must be their preaching twice a day, that they have to trust to, for being accounted deservedly painful Preachers: But if we consider how they that preach twice, spread and beat out their metal, and so slip it into two pieces, we shall perceive we have but two *Six pences* for a *shilling*, which may make more noise, and number, but weigh no more than one: And, in truth, upon tryal, considering likewise, what constant Repetitions and Introductions they make to their second Sermon, it will be found that to pass to a new subject on Afternoons, by Catechizing, and treating for half an hour on the principal heads of Christian doctrine, and worship, as it is more profitable and to the edification of the Generality, who are not puff'd up in their fleshly mind with the name of preaching, and the place from whence

whence it comes, the Pulpit, (which is their High Altar) so is it more difficult to the Performer of it. Now these things being so that there is as much work cut out by order of the Church for Ministers to finish, as ordinarily one mans strength of Body and Spirit can go through with, not prejudicing the health of him, (which God no ways requires) how spiteful and groundless is that charge, *viz.* That we have a lazy Ministry which they promise to out-do, when they are uppermost? If these Rules and Prescriptions of the Church which will certainly keep him from Idleness that observes them, more than their Discipline will, be not practised as becometh, themselves that accuse are in fault chiefly, who have shamefully traduced and opposed the same, and to gratifie whom, negligence hath been countenanced too far in these things; And so are they (whoever they be) that can content themselves with the titles, dignities, and profits of Governors of the Church, and withdraw themselves from their bounden duty and service to it, in seeing better execution done. I know their Apology is the strong hand of the Adversary opposing their endeavors in that behalf, which would have justified and vindicated them much more than now it doth, if they had not given evidence of their little sincerity and zeal for Religion in those things, which were free and easie for them to do, and for which they might have thanks on all sides: But Prudence forsooth, hath been so infinitely cryed up and magnified, and that consisting chiefly in doing nothing, and offending no body, but God Almighty, that Piety and zeal are no better then incivility and Pragmatiqueness, the Rule most sacredly observed by them being this, *We do not do it, therefore it ought not, or need not be done.* And thus while we are doubting what Government we should have, and how we should be ruled, are we made subject to the *Triumvirate* of Pride, Folly and Laziness, nothing being done without their consent and approbation: But this belongs more properly to the next place.

---



## CHAP. XVII.

*The Fifth General head wherein the Exercise of the Worship of God doth consist, Obedience. That Obedience is the end of the Law and Gospel both. That the service of God principally consisteth therein. Of Obedience to God and the Church. The Reasons and Necessity of Obedience to our Spiritual, as well as Civil Governors. The frivolous cavills of Sectaries noted. The Severity of the ancient and latter Greek Church in requiring Obedience. The Folly of Pretenders to Obedience to the Church, and wilfully slight her Canons and Laws more material, than are Ceremonies.*

Παῖς &  
Παιὺν Ἀ-  
ριστοῦ.

Deut. 4. 5.

6.

Chap. 6. 1, 2.

Heb. 5. 9.

**T**HE Third and last General head wherein consisteth the proper worship of God, is Obedience. The distinction of the Philosopher of Practice into Acts and Facts, holdeth very good in Religion, as well as Nature, or Morality: For, besides the Contemplative part, which imploies it self in the knowledge and consideration of the doctrine of Faith, there must of necessity be a Practical, or Operative Part, which is the end of the former; as is apparent out of holy Scriptures, as well as books of Philosophers. For, we read in *Deuteronomy*, how that Obedience was the end of the Commandments given to the Israelites, *Behold I have taught you Statutes and judgments, even as the Lord my God commanded me, that ye should do so in the Land whither ye go to possess it. Keep therefore and do them for this is your wisdom, and your understanding in the sight of all Nations.* And in the beginning of the fifth Chapter propounding the Law and Commandments given them by God, it followeth, *That thou mightest fear the Lord thy God, and keep all his Statutes and Commandments, which I command thee, Thou and thy Son and thy Sons Son, all the dayes of thy life, and that thy dayes may be prolonged. Hear therefore O Israel and observe to do it, that it may be well with thee.* Which condition and injunction is constantly annexed unto the Promises of Life and Salvation, in the Gospel: We read indeed frequently of being justified by Faith, and saved by Faith, and in what sense we have explained in its proper place, viz. as it implies the works and fruits of Faith, together with the acts of believing; and no otherwise: which is plainly affirmed by the Apostle to the *Hebrews*, speaking of Christ our High Priest, who being made perfect he became the author

thor of Salvation to all them that obey him. Sometimes Obedience is in Scripture put for believing it self, because Faith is a principal act of the will bowing, and yielding to God assent; as in the Acts of the Apostles; *We are his witnesses of these things, and so is also the Holy Ghost, whom God hath given to them that obey him*; That is, surely to them that did believe that testimony given of Christ by the Apostles: and so St. Peter speaks, *Likewise ye wives be in subjection unto your own Husbands, that if any obey not the word (i.e. believe and receive it not, but continue in infidelity) they also may be won by, &c.* So that it is one part of Obedience, to believe the truth revealed, by receiving it with an humble and ready mind: But this is no more than the root to the Tree, or the Tree to the Fruit, which is the end and perfection of all. Therefore our Saviour Christ Parabolically or Metaphorically saith in St. John: *I am the true Vine, and my Father is the Husbandman, Every branch in me that beareth not fruit, he purgeth it, that it may bring forth more fruit*: By Faith every true believer is inserted into Christ, and abides in his mystical body, as the branches do in the stock of the Tree; and this is the Act and Effect of Faith; but every branch that thus abides in Christ is to proceed to Acts, or Fruits of that Faith; and this is meant by bearing more fruit; the first no wayes sufficing. And Christs disciples asked him, *What shall we do that we may work the work of God*; he answered. *This is the work of God, that ye believe in him whom he hath sent*; That is, The proper and effectual means to work the work of God, is to believe in him, whom he hath sent. And, infinite other places in holy writ are there, which describe and require this obedience at our hands, as believers: For, as Chrysostom well hath noted; *It is no benefit at all to us to be Orthodox, so long as our lives are corrupt; as there is no profit of an exact Conversation, our Faith not being sound.* And Clemens Alexandrinus defines Piety, to be a *Practise following and waiting on God.*

Now there are two Principal Branches or Parts of a Religious and Holy life, according to our Church Catechism, and consent of all good Christians. Our Duty towards God, and our Duty towards our Neighbour: or as our Saviour in the Gospel expresseth it, in reducing all the Commandments to two, *Our Love of God, and Our Love of our Neighbour*: upon which hang all the Law and the Prophets: Love being here put for such Acts of Love, as justice, service, honor, charity and obedience according to the place and capacity we are in, as the Scripture requires at our hands: And to attain to this, we are to have before our Eyes the things wherein both do principally and more specially consist: And secondly, the means leading and moving us hereunto; which, because they are such copious subjects, that they require a proper treatise to enlarge upon, I shall not handle here, any further than offering these few heads and grounds of our holy and obedient walking with God first, and that as I find them without any great Art set down by Suidas, who I suppose collected them, as his manner was in other things from the Holy Servants of God before him: *Apostolical Conversation* (saith he) *consisteth in these Acts, and hath these Signs*: 1 *Strictness over the Eyes*; 2 *Governement of the tongue*; 3 *Subduing the body*; 4 *An humble opinion*; 5 *Purity of Mind*; 6 *Exclusion of anger*; 7 *Being compelled, yield*; 8 *Being smitten, offer thyself farther*; 9 *Being wronged, avenge not thyself*; 10 *Being hated, love*; 11 *Being persecuted, endure it*; 12 *Being reproached, pray for him*; 13 *Be dead unto Sin*; 14 *Be crucified to Christ*; 15 *Place all thy love on the Lord.*

Acts. 5. 32.

1 Pet. 3. 1.

John 15. 1, 2.

John 6. 28, 29.

Κέσθ' ἵδεν  
ἔσαι ἡμῖν τῶν  
ὑποκρίνων  
τοῦτον, ὅταν  
ἴδῃς διεσπαρ-  
μένον ἢ, &c.Chrys. Ser.  
56. Tom. 5.Ἐντολὴν ἔστι  
πρὸς τὴν ἐπομὴν  
ἐν τῇ ἀκρίβει-  
ᾳ τῆς Θεοῦ.  
Clem. Alex.  
p. 380.Mat. 22. 36,  
37, 38, 39.Suidas 'A-  
ποστολικὴ Πό-  
λις.

Mat. 5. 41.

Now the means to exercise these divine and Christian virtues, and to practise them, may be these, amongst many other: 1. To have a constant and clear eye of Faith in the presence of God, believing and being thoroughly assured that he beholds, and observes, and notes, and weighs our thoughts, words, and actions: as surely had *Enoch* who walked with God, 5. 24. And *Abraham* Gen. 17. 1. And more especially holy *David* Psal. 139. v. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, &c. 2. A Recognition and owning of the Power, Majesty, Justice and Mercy of God. 3. A free and total Resignation and submission of our selves to the will of God. 4. Patience and silence under the Providence of God. 5. Constant and fervent Invocation of God, as well for his helping, as healing and pardoning Grace. 6. A constant exerting and exercising of Gods Grace given unto us, by the proper action of Faith, Hope, and Charity: And these seven by having a constant regard to the commands and precepts of God: To the Promises of God: To the Threatnings of God to all: To the Judgments of God executed upon others for their wickedness and disobedience: To the Mercies of God singularly and plentifully conferred upon our selves: and lastly to the Torments of Hell and Joyes of Heaven. These are principally the things every good Christian is to attend, that would add to his Faith virtue, as *St. Peter* advises; and devout walking with God to his sound knowledge of him.

2 Pet. 1. 5.

And as Christ hath taught us, The second Part of our Obedience to him, is like unto it, consisting in Love of our Neighbour; Which divideth it self into two Parts, Doing him justice in all things: for as *St. Paul* saith to the *Romans*: *Love worketh no ill to its Neighbour, therefore Love is the fulfilling of the Law.* Secondly, doing him all brotherly and truly Christian Offices, either in respect of body, soul, or estate, which Christian Faith obliges us unto.

Rom. 13. 10.

But of all Justice, that is principally to be attended to, which ungodly hypocrites most contemn and violate, and that is of Obedience to our Superiors: For, whereas Christian Religion obliges us to mutual offices of Love and Charity one towards another, to forbear one another in love, with all lowliness and meekness and long suffering: And again, to submit our selves one to another, in the fear of God: And that the strong should bear the infirmities of the weak, and not to please themselves; certain Sectaries not having the Knowledge of God aright, or understanding in the Scriptures (in which they flatter themselves, they know more than any other) or the true fear of God before their eyes, do so corrupt and pervert the sense of the Holy Ghost, as indeed to destroy all that order of Government, Christ hath established in his Church as necessary to the being of the true Faith it self; though in some Formal language they would seem to allow of it: But this is only kept by them, as a reserve to relieve and fortifie themselves, when the time shall happen, that they shall get the Sceptre of power into their hands, and the Face of Authority to shew to others: For then, all their petty assaults, by such arguments as above said, are disown'd and rejected, as inconsistent with all Order in Christs Church; and more severe exactions of obedience maintained than they groaned under before: Then are these texts of force, which otherwise signifie nothing, or are eluded with a sigh, a wry look, sad complaint and a profession that they would submit, but that their Consciences will not suffer them; their consciences being so stated as never to accept of any Rule but their own: Christ saith; *He*  
that

Eph. 4. 2.  
Eph. 4. 21.  
Rom. 15. 1.



that beareth you beareth me, and he that beareth me beareth him that sent me: And to the Hebrews: Obey them that have the Rule over you, and submit your selves, for they watch for your souls, as they that must give an account, &c. And our Saviour Christ in St. Matthew alloweth so much uncharitableness (if we may so call it) and not, justice rather, to them that shall not hear the Church (which is certainly to stand to the determinations of the Church) as to number them among Publicans and Heathens: And this obedience is much illustrated by that required in civil Matters in the Scriptures; *Children obey your Parents in the Lord*, saith St. Paul: And *honor your Father and Mother*, saith the Decalogue; which the greatest opposers of obedience in practise, cannot choose, in their expositions of that commandment, to extend to Civil and Ecclesiastical, as well as Natural Parents: And St. Paul to the *Colossians* saith farther, *Children obey your Parents in all things: And Servants obey your Masters in all things*: But the misery and mischief is, that what St. Paul in his sixth Chapter to the *Ephesians* v. 1. used, and intended as an argument to induce men to obedience, is with wonted boldness and violence perverted against obedience. St. Paul saith, *Obey in the Lord*, that is, for Gods sake, and because God doth more require this of Christians, as they have greater and sounder knowledge of God, than have other men: For thus St. Peters words corresponding with St. Pauls advise, *Submit your selves to every ordinance of man, for the Lords sake*, that is, (as we have shewed before) *Humane Creature*, in authority by God: And the reason hereof is rendred presently after: *For so is the will of God*: These obligations and enforcements of this duty of obedience are from this Restriction, they are pleased to understand here, *In the Lord*, and for Gods sake, quite nulled and baffled to nothing: For, every thing that comes into their mind contrarying the degrees and commands of their Superiors, are presently made Canonical Scripture, with them; and so an absolute dispensation from all obligatoriness (as to their persons at least) of the Precepts of their Superiors. And whereas we have heard the Law of God so general and expresse for honouring, and obeying our Governors, that very rarely, and then only upon very weighty Causes and Grounds, a good Christian fearing to displease God in one law of his, as well as another, would scruple nothing more than disobedience: Now innumerable and those most empty and frivolous exceptions are framed to our selves, for the qualifying us for disobedience: For, what can be more monstrous and ridiculous at the same time, than when we are pressed so hard with the innocency, at least, of the thing lawfully required, which was ever looked upon as sufficient ground of Obedience to lawful Powers; that we have no more to oppose; we shelter our selves under this umbrage, *My mind and conscience is set against it*, though it cannot be said, why, but only: *So it is, therefore I cannot do it*: and therefore, you may look for subjection and obedience where you can get it; which is just no where, and in nothing; if this be good reason or religion: But there is much worse and unbecoming a tollerable heathen behind; which out of Principles of disorder, ruine, and confusion professes that no Obedience is due to Ecclesiastical Superiors in such things as you cannot bring proofs of Scripture, that God requires them: So that they will obey God (and who but they?) with a vengeance; but man not at all: For, if you bring Scripture for what you require, and they cannot pick a hole in it, nor evade it, (which were very strange and unheard of

Heb. 13. 17.

Mat. 18. 17.

Ephes 6. 1.

Col. 3. 20, 21.

1 Pet. 2. 13.

15.

in these dayes) then they will most freely submit, and obey; but not you, notwithstanding, but God, who requires it: But if you come only with the general Rules and Precepts of Obedience, and argue from the Power, God hath given those in authority, to order and dispose all things extrinsecal to the Faith, for the more uniform and charitable walking with God in doctrine and worship, then think they themselves absolved from any duty but that of resisting such attempts upon them: And which was never in the heart of any Heathen, Heretique, or Schismatic before late dayes, and much less in the mouth, a Principle directly contrary to nature, as well as Grace, is wickedly taken up and impudently professed, *That because a thing is commanded, and that by their lawful Superiors, they must not do it; otherwise possibly they might, and would;* And now is the matter no longer a Myſtery of iniquity, but such Impudency as though the Devil be not ashamed to put these men upon such unnatural, and un-Christian dogms, yet I question whether he would not blush to profess so much himself openly; For surely to him, that hath any fear of God, or reverence to man, this is, and ought to be a firm and constant principle: *To obey all that are in authority over him, not usurping that Power,* in all things which are not expressly contrary to the word of God. And the questions wherein these mens Religion and learning lye chiefly, are quite from the purpose, when to withdraw obedience, they ask; Whether such a thing is necessary to Salvation or not which is required? thinking they are free, if it be answered, No. For, though the thing it self be not necessary to Salvation, the obedience may: And disobedience may certainly damn those, whom, in such Cases, Obedience would not certainly save: Again, we see no reason to lay aside that excellent and ancient distinction of things *necessary* and *profitable* to Salvation; or if not absolutely to Salvation, to Charity and Edification, mentioned by *Ivo Carnotensis*; And even these are to be observed, and that for their own sake, and Churches sake requiring them, as well as the others, though not in the same degree of obedience, or necessity.

It is received as part of the Greek Churches Canon-Law, what *Nicophorus* answered to the demand of *Theodosius* a Monk objecting, that men generally could not endure so much: *as to hear of the Canonical Precepts of the Church: This ill becomes your Vertue: For they who will not admit of such, are no wayes of the Party of Christians:* And it was of old the opinion of *Tertullian*, *They who transgress the Rule of Discipline, cease to be reckoned among Christians:* And as *Clemens Alexandrinus* saith, *As it becometh a person of Equity to falsifie in nothing, and to go back from nothing that he hath promised, although others should break Covenants; so it becometh us to transgress the Ecclesiastical Canon in no manner:* And to convince any man of conscience, or fear of God, of this *Balsamon's* reasons, may suffice demonstrating a greater reverence and respect to be due to the Constitutions of the Church, than to the Laws of the State: For, (saith he) *the Canons being explained and confirmed by Kings and Holy Fathers, are received as the Scriptures: But the Laws [of the State] were received and established by Kings alone; and therefore do not prevail against the Scriptures nor the Canons.* And this I rather instance in from the Greek than Latin Church, because the ignorant and loud clamors of Sectaries have had nothing more to alledg against the Sacredness of Ecclesiastical Constitutions than that which serves their turns in all things; Popishness of Canonical Obedience: But may they judg what they please, according

Vid. Ivonem  
Carnot. Praef.  
ad Decret.

Οἱ γὰρ μὴ  
πάντα δεχέ-  
μενοι, ὅτι τῆς  
τῶν Χριστιανῶν  
μερίδος ὅλος  
ἔστι. Juris  
Grac. Rom.  
l. 5. p. 344.

Qui excedunt  
de Regula, dis-  
cipline defini-  
unt haberi  
Christiani.  
Tertul. Clem.  
Alex. Strom.  
7. p. 753 &  
764.

See Photius's  
Nomocanon.  
Tit. l. c. 2.  
cum Balsamo-  
ne p. 817, 818.

cording as design and interest sway them, this we constantly and confidently affirm; that, whoever despises the Rules of of Obedience and Laws of the Church, cannot rise higher in that Part of Christian Religion which we call, *Worship of God*, than may meer Moral men: Because that which chiefly distinguishes good Christians from good honest Heathens next to the doctrine of Faith, is proportionable Obedience, as well to those God hath substituted under him to ordain things omitted in the Scriptures, for the security of the Faith, regulating devotion, and worship, and peace of the Church: none of which can long subsist without such a Power acknowledged and obeyed in the Governors of the Church: And this apparently is at the bottom of the deceitful pretences of Christian Liberty, and Conscience for disobedience of them who are designed thereby to ruine and overthrow; as matter of fact hath demonstrated.

But it is not only the Puritans intollerable dogms against obedience, but the contrary practise of no small persons of place, and esteem in the Church, who can heartily, and with zeal even to indignation, prosecute Sectaries in conformity to the Discipline and Rites of the Church, glorying and boasting that they are Sons of the Church, and yet do more mischief to the Church by their ill govern'd persons, as to common honesty, sobriety and gravity, and more advance, and bring into credit, and reputation, the enemies of the Church, than all their fair and fallacious pretences could otherwise possibly do. If such persons, who have not attained to common Moral prudence, or Philosophy, bear such kindness as they flourish with, to the Church, let them shew it as that lewd Fellow in the Athenian Senate was advised, who notwithstanding his vicious life, had somewhat very beneficial to the Common-wealth to propound in the Senate; and commend it by the mouth of another: For, what can be more absurd and ridiculous than for any such person to profess esteem to that Church which condemns him, more than any other Society? And whereas it supposes as a foundation, natural justice, continence and temperance, and the like moral virtues, to the divine Precepts and Institutions of Perfection: what may turn the stomach, and raise laughter more at a man, then for such an one to discover his offense at an unceremonious Puritane, the matter of whose Crime is nothing comparable to his? If thou beest a Christian (saith a holy Father) either speak as thou livest, or live as thou speakest: What evil spirit hath set thee on first to abuse thy self with scandalous practises, and then the Church by taking Sanctuary in it? Can stupidity so far accompany vice, as first to break the known and common Laws and Rules of good conversation, which is affront enough to the Church, and then to add to that affront, by professing a special duty to that, which thereby is destroyed? There is no Sect or Schism whose Orders and Laws of Christian walking with God can be compared with those of the Church of *England*, there being nothing amongst them, besides Faith, which an *Heathen* may not do, that never heard of Christian Perfection, accounting nothing needful to be done, nothing unlawful to them which is not punishable by the Law of man, or against the light of nature: Christ (they say) hath purchased for them a liberty to do what they please, in eating, drinking, sleeping, and other matters, so that they wrong not their own bodies, nor injure their Neighbors; And shall there be that protect themselves under this Churches shelter, in such light, loose, foolish and vicious courses to the degrading of it beneath her inferiors? Is this to be sons of the Church; and not only so but to brag that such they are, in open hostility to it? I



I confess notwithstanding all this, in comparing the enemies to the true Faith together, we are to distinguish between the doers of evil simply, and the teachers of men so to do: And that though drunkenness and uncleanness, be greater sins by far, in their nature, than is dissent from a ceremony, or Rite not necessary in its nature: Yet for any man with a spirit of opposition and contention to take upon him to declare against such an unnecessary order, and teach men against the unity and peace of the Church, otherwise than becomes him, is no less criminal, in the consequence, before God; yea probably much more than those other more scandalous before men, and will more endanger his Soul.

But concerning such persons as are in profession really Sons, and perhaps Fathers of the Church, and yet wilfully and studiously violate the Laws, Constitutions, Rubricks, or Canons of it, no necessity compelling them, no reason being to be alledged defending them, but what is taken from their ease, which otherwise would be much interrupted; or their benefit and profit which would be much hindered, I leave their own hearts and Consciences to condemn them, until God himself doth: which certainly without repentance, he will; and that out of their own consciences and mouths; their consciences which witness, that these are the true causes of their negligence and contempt of their Duty in their proper stations; and their mouths and professions, in that they pretend obedience, and are much offended at the disobedience of *Puritans*; as if God and the Church would be sufficiently satisfied with their Anger against them, while they themselves regard it no farther than is for their turn.

Two vulgar apologies I shall here take notice of, only: For as for that which is also commonly said, that evil times hinder them from their duty, I shall say no more but humbly advise them to deal sincerely with God and their own consciences in such cases, and examine themselves, whether that be the only cause: The first of these is Custom, which hath made the Laws and Canons more favourable: And what is this custom? A direct violation of the Laws of the Church and Orders and Precepts of it; and then a bold reply to an objector of this to them: *It is not kept, i.e.* They do not keep themselves to such prescriptions, therefore they ought not; and therefore it is as well as it is: For custom, what is it they mean by it? If a Custom of an hundred years hath confirmed a Law, a Custom of one year, when it lets in the said Graces of Idleness, ease, and profit, shall prescribe and prevail against it: If infinite persons backed by Laws have done, or not done such things; and one or two indulgers to themselves, have transgressed on the contrary, these are the Presidents we choose for us; these we alledge for our defense, This is that we call a Custom; and soon by the flattery and temptation of the foresaid virtues, will the infection spread, and the party become so numerous, strong and bold, as to condemn those who make doubt of being *Customed* by them; and to deride them as *Hyperbolic* Conformists to the Canons and Laws of the Church: So that without some stop and fence against this encroaching and daring mischief, all things will be sum'd up briefly into these two things: First, that there be a Custom to make Laws and Rules for the modelling of the Church, and regulating the worship of God therein: And another

ther far greater and more prevalent custome, that none of them should be kept which agrees not with the conscience of the Sectary, and the convenience of the Church Party themselves, as well Rulers as obeyers.

Another Grand *salvo* against observation of any Ecclesiastical Canons to our temporal prejudice, is taken from *Dispensations* obtained to the contrary: And then conscience may be as secure as might the Disciples, when Christ going towards his Passion, said to them, *Sleep on now, and take your rest*; and upon the same reasons too, *Behold the Son of Man is betrayed into the hands of Sinners*: Much here might be said concerning the nature, reasons, end, and effect of *Dispensations*; but this place cannot contain it: Only thus much of the nature and use of *Dispensations*: That it being not possible for the wit of Man to invent a Law which will not sometimes bring mischief and inconvenience, contrary to the Institutor of it, it is necessary there should be a Power of judging, wherein it is inconsistent with the true ends and intention of the Law, and Author of it; and therefore *Dispensation* (saith *Barbosa*) is defined to be a *Relaxation of the Law, with the knowledge of the Reason or Cause in him that hath power to dispense*: From whence it follows, that unless the cause be so just and reasonable, that it is probable that the author of the Law, or Canon himself never intended they should bind in such cases; both the Dispenser and Dispensed incur the guilt of the violation of that law so dispensed with which causes are so rare. That, perhaps in the very judgment of them, that find the benefit of them, it were much better that particular inconveniences should befall some men, then such a door be opened as is commonly to the ambition, Covetousness and Laziness of men to baffle the rule it self, and make it ridiculous: And therefore, in the Church of *Rome* it self, where *Dispensations* abound most of all, and most notorious, yet the Canonists cannot chuse but call them *Odious*, and a *Dispensation* when just cause is wanting: And where Personal advantage sometimes to the Dispenser or his Retinue, and most commonly to the Dispensed, is the chief or only Ground of *Dispensations*, they can never be good, unless this benefit relates chiefly to nature, as bodily health, and not Fortune: For tis so grand and general a mistake of the effect of them, that it is to be feared it is affected in many, to think that *Dispensations* ought to be ordained to relieve from the penalties, and not the guilt of the Law: For, that is truly and alone an effectual dispensation, which exempts us from the obligation to perform it: and not that which only excuses from the Punishments we should otherwise incur; And doth declare and satisfie a man, that in not observing the Letter of the Law, he doth not go contrary to the intention of it; which in such cases would not that it should be rigorously observed. Now if a man be soundly satisfied in his conscience, first that the Law it self would, if it could speak, acknowledg the reason to be good, of not keeping to the letter of it, then a dispensation would stand him in good stead, in securing him from the penalties belonging to the same: But if men look no farther than that which is least considerable in *Dispensations*, and meerly accidental, *viz.* the saving themselves harmless, under the breach of it; they are notoriously deceived in the vertue of them: For, no dispensation can avail any man, which doth not make the thing just and reasonable to be done, or not done: I shall give but one instance of this error, and the Evil of procuring dispensations (whereas they should

Mat. 26. 45;

*Definitur Dispensatio, quod sit juris communis relaxatio cum causa cognitione, in eo qui potestatem habet dispensandi.* Barb. de offic. & Pat. Epist. Al. 33. num. 3. Part. 2.

Ib. num. 7. *Est quid Odiosum—Sine causa est Dispensatio.*

Nicholaus de  
Clemangis de  
Studio Theo-  
log. apud Pa-  
cherium. To.  
7. Sed forte  
dicent, secum,  
&c.

should rather be injoyed than sought for out of private ends) out of  
*Nicholas de Clemangis: But perhaps (saith he) some will say, that it is dis-  
pens'd with them by the Bishop his Superior, that he should reside with his  
Sheep: Why didst thou seek for that dispensation, will the Judge say? Why with  
importunity didst thou extort that liberty of not doing that which thou know-  
est thou wert bound to do? Wherefore didst thou retain the name of that Of-  
fice, if thou wouldst not officiate? To this end wert thou made a Rector, that  
thou mightest govern; therefore a Shepherd, that thou mightest feed: Were  
your Studies such that my Sheep must perish for which I shed my blood? Why  
wouldst thou assume the place of a fit Pastor, and not discharge the work? An-  
other would have fed my flock, preserv'd it, attended it, lead it, and been re-  
sident with it, and have gained to me out of it: Dost thou think thou wert  
made a Shepherd for this, that thou mightest neglect my flock, and leave it in  
the wildernes, and wander about through Towns, Citys, and High-ways,  
with the wanton and idle, while the wolves scatter my flock, &c. This and  
much more that zealous Person, who now would be accounted discon-  
tented, and envious, and troublesome: But here I end this; only with  
this reasonable request, that men pretending to true Religion, and to be  
cordially addic'ted to the Good of the Church, or Glory of God, would  
use more civility and common Ingenuity, if not conscience towards both,  
then purposely, and industriously to involve and cumber themselves  
with multiplicities of inconfisting Cares and Cures, and then use it as  
sufficient excuse for their ill discharge of their Duty in all, or most of  
them, That they have so many occasions, as that they cannot attend on  
them all, as they confess they should; and say, they would: For, this is  
plainly to mock God and the Church too: But experience proveth this  
to be too true, that they who are most engaged in multitude of imploy-  
ments or charges, seldom perform so much service to all of them put to-  
gether, as he that hath but one single Charge, doth to it alone.*



## CHAP. XVIII.

*Of Obedience to the Church in Particular, in the Five Precepts of the Church common to all, viz.*

1. *Observation of Festival Dayes.* 2. *Observation of the Fasts of the Church: Of the Times, Manner, and Grounds of them. Exceptions against them answered.* 3. *Of the Customs and Ceremonies of the Church.* 4. *Frequentation of the Publick Worship.* 5. *Frequent Communicating; and the due preparation thereunto.*

**I**T was well said by a Reverend Person of our Church, even where he argues against the blind obedience of the Roman Church: *Certainly the inestimable benefits which we receive from the Church, who feeds us with the Word and Sacraments, deserves from us an humble acknowledgment, and obedient confidence in her, yea, it is spiritual treason not to obey her.* And though I dare not say with Catharinus against Cajetan, *The Precepts of the Church are to be received with the same degree [of honour]* yet I may say with as real reverence, as the Precepts of God, if they be good, thus far that they both bind alike under pain of eternal damnation. So that there could scarce any doctrine be devised more pestilent to the Church, or pernicious to the souls of Men, then that which infuses into mens heads, to obey the Church as little as they can possibly, without danger from the Civil Magistrate, or express and particular violation of some text of Holy Writ; alwayes excepted, that more then Antichristian Dogme, *That men should refuse to do any thing enjoyned by any lawful Authority, because it is commanded;* least, forsooth, their Christian liberties should be invaded. But Bernard was certainly a much better Christian in this subject, then these men, to whom none in their own opinions are to be compared; who tells us, *Whatever of Obedience is yielded unto them that are set over us, is given unto him who saith, He that heareth you, heareth me, &c.* especially when the things so enjoyned tend so directly to the service of God, as doth those particularly commended unto our practise, by our Church; against which the Adversaries arguments are taken from the general quarrel, they have against such Governours, whom they would not have to rule at all, but come under them; or from the things themselves, which, they give out, are against the Word of God, because, against their Negative Superstitions. When we therefore propound to them and all faithful servants of God, and true obedient and humble children of the Church, the *Five Precepts of the Church*, we suppose them to whom they are directed, to be free from the leaven and infection of Schism and Stubbornness; we suppose them to be bred and e-

Donnes Pseudomartyrs, chap. 6. p. 180.

*In eodem gradu habenda sunt precepta Ecclesie, si bona sunt, quo & ipsius Dei, quoad hoc, quod similiter ligant &c.* Catharinus Annotat. in Com. Cajet. lib. 2.

Bernard. de Virtute Obedientie.

educated in the bosome of the Church; and to have no other Fathers in Christ, than the Fathers of the Church. For when they have made defection from that body, of which they are, or were Members, either in heart and affections, or outward declaration against it; then, no wonder, if a thousand malicious reasons be at hand to enervate the commands upon them, and defie all Authority. But they who hold to their sound profession, and have any honour for their spiritual Parents, as well as natural, or respect to the Fifth Commandment, which themselves generally interpret to extend to Religious, as well as Moral Obedience and Offices, whose interest will not suffer them to observe it, cannot boggle at the reasonable use of Power in requiring such things, nor at the Piety of the Precepts themselves.

Church Calendar.

Chryf. To 5.  
Serm. 88. p.  
602, 603.

Now the Five Precepts of the Church are these, which have been with long continuance as to time, and with great conscience, as to all good Christians, observed, drawn out of our Liturgy by the Authour of the *Collection of Private Devotions, or Hours of Prayers*. First to observe the Festival or Holydayes appointed. Of the reasonableness whereof we have before spoken. The manner of keeping them, is by suspending all humane busineses, wherein Justice and Mercy (which are to be preferred before Sacrifice) do not principally consist, inconsistent with that due service of God, on that day celebrated. It is plain, that before distinction of days set apart in special manner to the praise of God, which we now call *Holidayes*, there was a daily publick worship solemnly used by the Church, and Christians held themselves bound to be present at the same. For *Origen* upon *Leviticus*, affirms, That to Christians every day was an Holiday and Festival. And to the same purpose *St. Chrysostome*, in whose age the special Memory of Saints was frequent, saith, that *Every day is a Feast to a Christian*. And out of *Austin* and others, it is manifest that there was wont to have been a daily communication by Christians of the Eucharist. But this so solemn and constant attendance on Gods worship, ill agreeing with mens daily civil employments, it was the wisdom and piety of the Church, to restrain the more solemn Service of God to some special days, which was signalized with the memory of Christ, or his eminent Servants and Saints. So that if Sectaries would but keep to the grounds of Christianity, rather than natural Policie and Interest, they might find the contrary to that Calumny against the Church, viz. That it restrains men in their callings. For the Church hath rather made a Relaxation and Indulgence to men in order to their worldly affairs, than laid any new restraints upon them, in that it hath much lessened the number of Festivals, to what they were twelve or thirteen hundred years ago, and much more in the later days of the Roman Church. It is a gross and prophane Errour of modern Sectaries, to imagine that there is no obligation upon Christian people, to repair to the house of God every day, whether to publick or private Devotion, as we have said before: but much greater, to imagine that the obligation is not yet stronger, when the Authority of the Church determines the time and place, though there be no Sermon, there to offer their Prayers unto God, and be instructed and edified out of the Word of God.

But I hold it best (considering the many prejudices and superstitious fumes that are bred in the minds of too many simple Christians, concerning the use of Gods house and the worship therein) to propound, what might more accurately be spoken of that subject from the opinion of *Chrysostome*, that devout and judicious Father, in an Homily against such as absented themselves too much from the House of God, in these words, so near as I could

could translate them. He that loves, doth not only desire to see his friend whom he loveth, but the very house only, and the gate: yea, not only the gate of the house, but the very holes and passages thereunto. And if he sees but the garment or pantofle of his beloved, he imagines himself to be present. Such were the Prophets, because they saw not God who is incorporeal, they beheld his House, and by his House imagined they had him present. I should choose to be prostrate [παρὰ τὸν θῖον] in the House of God, rather than to dwell in the Tents of sinners. Every place, Every Room compared with the House of God, is the Tent of sinners; though it be a Court of Justice, though it be a Council-house, though any mans private House: For though there should be Prayers, though Supplications there, yet must there necessarily be strifes, and contentions, and evil language, and debates about secular cares. But this House is clear from all these. Wherefore, they are the Tents of wicked men; but this the House of God. And as the shore, free from winds and waves, affords great safety to the Barks which put into them: In like manner the House of God, drawing such as enter into it from the storms of outward businesses, causeth them to abide in great calmness and security, and to hear the Oracles of God. This place is the Foundation of Vertue, the School-house of Philosophy [or wisdom] and that not only at the time of assembling, when the Word of God is heard, and spiritual Doctrine, and the Reverend Fathers are assembled; but likewise at every other time. Enter into the Porch only, and suddenly, as it were, a spiritual Brees incloses thy soul. And this quietness leads thee to trembling, and teaches thee to be wise: It elevates the mind, and suffereth thee not to mind these present things: It transports thee from Earth to Heaven. And if so, great benefit doth accrue unto thee being there, when there is not any Congregation, what great profit must they needs reap who are then present, and what great damage must they suffer who are absent, when the Prophets on all sides sound forth, when the Apostles are preached, when Christ stands in the midst, when the Father disposes matters there done; when the Holy Spirit affordeth its own joyes. Would ye know where such persons spend their time, who despise the Congregation, what witholds them, and what withdraws them from this sacred Table, and of what is there discoursed: Or rather I know clearly: For rather they prate of absurd and ridiculous matters, or are fix'd on worldly cares. But both these exercises fail of pardon, and have extream punishment. And for the former, there is no need so much as of a word or demonstration. Yea, that they who pretend the affairs of their house, and alledge the unsupportable necessity from thence, can by no means obtain pardon, being called once a week, and even not then enduring the preferring of Spiritual before Earthly things, is apparent from the Gospels. For they who were called to the spiritual Marriage, made such excuses as these: One, that he had bought a yoke of Oxen; one, that he had purchased a field; another, that he had married a bride: but they were all alike punished. They may be necessary causes, but when God calls, they are no Apology: For after God, all things are necessary: After his honour, let all other things be regarded. For what servant, I pray tell, attends the affairs of his own house before he hath finished his Lords service, &c. And in another place he as plainly and zealously contendeth for the Time, as here he doth for the Place of Gods worship; directly refuting the vain imaginations of them in his days, who contented themselves in appearing in Gods House on Festival days only (I would we had not them that had learnt worse Doctrine then this.) Such (saith he) are to be perswaded to communicate

Chrysostom.  
Εὐαγγελιστὴς τῆς  
Στολῆς δὲ τῶν,  
&c. Pag. 1. 2.  
103. Tom. 9.

Psal. 84.

Chryf. Pro-  
p. in 6. Orat.  
in Annam.  
Tom. 5. p. 78.  
& To. 8. p. 8.



Matth. 18.20.

communicate according to every Festival assembly. For though (saith he) *Whitsuntide* is passed, yet the Feast is not over: For every coming together is a Feast. Whence doth this appear? From the very words of Christ himself, whereby he saith, Where two or three are gathered together in my Name, I am there in the midst of them. But when Christ is in the midst of them assembled, what other proof of a Feast would ye have greater than this? Where there is teaching and praying, where are the Benedictions of the Fathers, the hearing of Laws, where the assembling of Brethren is, and the bond of sincere Charity, where there is conversing with God, and God discourses with men, why should we not call that a Feast and Solemn meeting? &c. Thus he. And are not all these to be had many dayes, even when there is no Sermon? And have not men been of late taught to despise, and prophanely deride such incomparable daily blessings as these, and the benefits flowing from them; the more is the shame, and the more is the pity. God of his great mercy and grace teach us better, and better settle us and incline us: delivering us from that prophane imposture, which hath of late been wrought into the minds of Christians most unchristianly, that it is needless, nay perhaps worse, superstitious, in publick or private manner to visit Gods House by Prayers and Praises offered there to him, but when a Sermon is at hand.

Directions  
after the Ka-  
lendar and  
Rubrick after  
the Nicene  
Creed.

A second Precept of the Church is to all conscientious Christians, and obedient Children of God and the Church, *To observe the Fasts of the Church*: which Fasts the Church makes fourfold: The Fourty Days of Lent: Ember Days at the four Seasons, being the Wednesday, Friday, and Saturday after the first Sunday in Lent; after the Feast of Pentecost; after *September* the Fourteenth; and after *December* the Thirteenth: The Three Rogation days, being the Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday before Holy Thursday, or the Ascension of our Lord. In all which we must note and suppose that Fasting it self in general is the Ordinance of God himself, and not of the Church: this duty in a manner contrary unto that of rejoycing unto God and Feasting, standing upon the same Grounds that Festivals and Days of Thanksgiving to God, do. For first, it seems to be so far natural to man as Religion it self is; All people, that worship a God, having generally their vicissitudes of Feasting and Fasting, according to occasions justly offered, or the prudence of the first Founders and Administratours of that Religion. Again, By the Precepts and Precedents contained in the Scriptures, is Fasting required so that no instances are needful to confirm the same. And the true reason why the Precepts positive in the Old Testament are but few, is because it was agreeable to the Law of Nature, that it was not so needful to add multitude of positive Injunctions to confirm the same. The most expresse, if not only Law given concerning this in the Scriptures, is that of *Leviticus* the 16th, *vers.* 29. where God ordains that on the Seventh Moneth they should afflict their souls for ever, by a perpetual statute; but in what manner is not expressed, whether by abstaining from all meat, or their ordinary dyet, is not mentioned, but the Tradition and Custom of the Jewish Church interpret it to be total Abstinence, until the Evening; that is, the Sun going down. And the reason why no expresse Precept is given in the Gospel to Fast, where many Directions and Rules are given to Fast is, because, To Fast was a settled practise of old in the Church of God, and needed nothing more then the accommodation thereof to the future state of the Gospel, which was done partly by the said Advices and Instructions

Instructions how to Fast, and partly by the power and prudence of the Governours of the Church, extending to such ends.

But they say against this, That Fasting must be voluntary, and not of constraint and necessity, and therefore must not Authority impose such duties upon Christians, but they must take them up freely, or omit them, according to their Christian Liberty. But this miserable and contentious exception they are forced to recal again, though they would not be seen in it, to save themselves: who being in Power, however acquired, propose and impose both Fasts and Feasts at their pleasures: so that they plainly mean, That such Fasts are only to be enjoined by themselves, who cannot (as all others commanding contrary to them) possibly injure Christians in their Liberty: For so saith *Thomas Cartwright*, mocking *St. Paul*, *We cannot do any thing against the truth, but for the truth.* But farther, we say, Not only all Fastings, but Prayer and Hearing of the Word of God, yea all Moral Vertues, as Justice and Temperance, ought to be freely taken up of every good Christian: but doth it therefore follow, they may not be enjoined? Or lastly, doth it follow, that what is commanded and conditionally necessary, may not be freely chosen, if not according to the utmost extent of liberty of will according to Philosophy, yet according to the Divine and Scriptural sense, in which whatsoever is done readily, chearfully, and willingly in the Service of God, is accepted of God, who loveth a chearful giver, as the Scripture affirms, not taking notice whether there be any incumbent necessity or not, upon the person. And may not, what *St. Peter* advises and exhorts the Elders and Governours of the Church to, *viz. To feed the Flock of Christ among them, taking the oversight thereof not by constraint, but willingly*, concern the governed equally? May not there be a constraint upon these, as well as on them in their Ranks, consisting with a laudable willingness? Nay more than so, and quite contrary to the Divinity of factious Pastours and Flocks, should the laudableness of the thing it self, fortified and enforced with the Commands of Superiours, make men that have any just pretences to Christianity, more willing and chearful in the performance of those duties? This was ever wont to be so, until pestilent tongues had corrupted the minds and hearts of simpler Christians to make them suspect, hate, and oppose whatever their Governours ordained, and then to argue, *They can by no means do so, because they do not like it, and this dislikes their Consciences.* *St. Paul* saith, *Do all things without murmuring or disputings*: these modern Doctours say, *Do nothing without murmurings and disputings.* Let therefore this be one motive and qualification to Fasting, that it be done willingly, and the rather because it is required.

2 Cor. 9. 7.

1 Pet. 5. 2.

Phil. 2. 14.

A second reason is to excite to humiliation, and to quicken our Devotions in Prayers and Repentance, while we judge our selves unworthy of Gods common benefits otherwise appointed. But not to excurr here on this subject, as I might: Let it suffice to relate here both the Description and Grounds of Fasting, as we find them in our Churches Homilies. *Fasting is a withholding of meat and drink and all natural food from the body, for the determinate time of Fasting.* Again, *There are three ends of Fasting:* 1. *Chastizing the Flesh.* 2. *Fervencie of Spirit.* 3. *Sign of Humiliation.*

Homilies  
Church of  
England,  
2. Part. p. 85.  
& 78.

But

Ecclef. 35, 1, 2

Hom. 84. To.  
5. & Tom. 1.  
Hom. 8.

1 Tim. 4:3.

But idle and ignorant persons give the same definition to Fasting as they do to Repentance. For to abstain from sin, is both Fasting and Repentance: not considering, as we have before shewed, how that things, when the end and effect of them is highly commended and magnified, are vulgarly described by them, yet remain in nature altogether distinct: as in that remarkable place of *Syracides*, *He that keepeth the Law bringeth offerings enough: he that taketh heed to the commandment, offereth a Peace-offering. He that requiteth a good turn, offereth fine flour: and he that giveth alms, sacrificeth praise.* Were not he (think we) an excellent Interpreter that should take these expressions in the strictest sense they are delivered? And is not he the very same that shall define either Repentance or Fasting by abstinence from sin, in a proper sense, as all definitions ought to be framed in? *St. Chrysostome*, who in a certain Sermon speaks as much as any, in behalf of abstinence from sin, as a Fast truly acceptable to God, was never so mad or silly as to exclude thereupon outward and bodily Fasting: but in very many Sermons of his upon *Genesis* (which were delivered in the time of Lent, as were *St. Basils* also upon the Six days work of God) nothing occurs more frequently then that literal and outward Fasting commended to his hearers. Infinite might be the citations to prove the Judgment of the holy Fathers and Martyrs, and Monks in this particular: but it is confessed by dissenters, who know any thing above the Divinity of *Ursin* and *Calvin*, and such like unhappy masters of Errours in this point.

And what are the other principal reasons against such Fastings as our Church, by vertue of Canonical obedience, enjoins? Why, A superstitious discrimination of Meats, as if some were cleaner than other, under the Gospel. This they would needs bring it to, because they can do nothing without this, which is just nothing. For they say, out of the Decalogue, *Six days shalt thou labour and do all that thou hast to do*, Therefore must thou not keep any Holy-day to Gods Service but Sunday: So say they, God hath created all Meats to be received with Thanksgiving, Therefore you must not abstain from them. Indeed, one place excellently well interprets the other: For just as God hath said *Six days shalt thou work*; so hath he said, *All Meats shall be eaten under the Gospel*. And as it would be unlawful under that supposed command, to rest on any of the Six days from labour, so is it unlawful under the Gospel to fast or abstain from meat any one day. How can, or dare any man, if such arguing as this will hold good, cease any one day from eating and drinking, if it be a command that we must eat and drink all meats now, not hurtful to our bodies, and that without any exception or limitation of time? Do not they much more offend against Christian liberty and Gods command, who will not eat at all, those creatures that God hath commanded or sanctified to our use, by his Word, than they who eat some sort of Gods good creatures, but omit others? But undoubtedly God never intended to enact a formal Law, or give a Precept that the one or other should be done, but to grant a liberty and indulgence so to do: Now no Indulgences are Commands, nor being not accepted generally, offend the Donor. God in the Decalogue had chosen one day to himself; and for the six remaining, left them free to do that which he forbade to do on the Seventh: And this is all that is meant by *Thou shalt labor six days*: God under the Gospel, hath taken of the distinction of meats clean and unclean legally; and freely pronounces us at liberty to eat what of them we please: for none of them can hurt or defile us *naturally*, as the *Manicheans* held; nor any  
Legally



Legally as the Jews held : But they may *Evangelically* and Morally I hope, when we commit gluttony with them : may they not ? Yes, excess they except ; but their Argument excepts not excess, taken from the natures of things : For ten pounds of meat, and many quarts of wine, are as clean as an ounce, or a pint, and God hath made all alike. And so fish is as clean, and as much Gods creature as flesh, and flesh as fish. Have they heard of any so blockish as to deny it of late daves ? But what saith St. Paul, *They are evil to that man who eateth with offence.* Offence of whom ? Of a mans own self ? no surely ; but offence of others. And to eat against lawful commands, fish or flesh, is an offence to Superiours : and that is much more an offence, than to offend ones equal, ones brother, or inferior ; as it would be for a man to strike his Master or Father, than his Brother or Fellow servants. Whence then, I wonder to astonishment, should it proceed to credibility, that the Conscience of an obscure and inferior Christian (no doubt but an extraordinary person in his own eyes and opinion) should preponderate the outward Laws, and inward Consciences of his Governours, according to which, restrictions were devised and concluded ? Against such *Ægyptian* Pursuers of the Israel of God, the Church, a cloud of Witnesses may be opposed : but they who dare consult ancient Presidents, know it too well to put it to that issue : That of the resolute and conceited man in the Comedian, fitting their purpose much better, *Ego mihi video, Ego mihi sapio, Ego mihi credo plurimum :* I see for my self, I am wise for my self, I believe my self exceedingly. And therefore to small purpose is it to use allegations here, which for the Observation of the *Lenton* Fast hath been so amply and exactly handled by a late Right Reverend and Learned Hand. And for the *Vigils, Septuagesima, Sexagesima, Ember and Rogation* weeks, sufficient Authority and Reason are produced before their distinct Offices in the above-mentioned *Collection of Private Devotions*, of old composed, and by Authority instituted to the benefit of such as pretend to be of the Reformation established : But those that are taught solemnly to quarrel at the whole, no wonder they oppose it in such parts of it. But yet something to their fears of superstition in distinction of Meats, besides what is already said. What if they be mistaken, and the Church distinguishes not fish from flesh ? Undoubtedly at the first Institution of Fasts, Christians were equally interdicted both : and this custom is to this day retained in the Greek Church : Our Christian Ancients not distinguishing between the flesh of fishes, and the flesh of beasts properly so called, living on the earth : Imitating in their Fasts the perpetual Abstinence of the Fathers before the Flood, eating neither one nor other, but contenting themselves with the fruits of the earth, and of trees : flesh and wine being brought into the World together by Noah, for the use of man. For as *Clemens Alexandrinus* hath observed, Man before the Flood was an eater of Grain, rather than of Flesh. And *Origen* after him upon *Genesis*, saith, *This History plainly declares that God at first only permitted herbs and the fruits of Trees for mans food : But afterward license was granted to Noah to eat flesh.* And St. *Hierome*, about the beginning of his Treatise against *Jovinian*, saith the same ; and of late, *Munster* and others : which to cite here, were needless.

The Western Church, for ought can be perceived, at first abstained equally from fish and flesh. And therefore St. *Hierome*, where he states the case of the Church making choice of Meats, and shows the difference between the judgment of it and Hereticks ; (such as were *Marcion* and *Tatianus*,

Rom. 14.20.

Plautus.

Σισσηγιος ἢ  
Σαρκοφάγος,  
Clem. Alex.  
Strom. 7. p.  
717.  
Origen. in  
Gen. 1. v. 29.  
Hieronym. in  
Jovin. lib. 1.  
Munsterus in  
Gen. 3. 17.

2 Tim. 4.  
Hieron. in  
Jovin. lib. 2.  
cap. 11.

*tianus*, of whom he understandeth the Apostle to speak in his Second Epistle to *Timothy*) addeth, *Nec hoc dicimus, quod negamus Pisces, & cetera, si voluntas fuerit, in cibo esse sumenda*: whereby it may seem, as if no less scruple had been made about the eating fish then of flesh. But it is evident that about that time, some distinction in *Use*, not in *Nature* of Meats, was made by the Church; nothing scarce more frequently occurring in the decrees of Councils and Fathers writings, than the defense of the Church her practise in discriminating Meats, and yet condemning and anathematizing such Hereticks, as abstained from any Meats proper for mans use out of opinion of uncleanness, that should be naturally in some more than others. But the Western Church, through favour and indulgence, hath for many Ages permitted the use of fish to all obedient Sons; as also of wine, at such times as her Fasts are observed. It is therefore a great mistake in her Enemies and Accusers, to judge her of rigour in limiting Christians to such sort of Meats, as are now allowed: For it was rather her act of Grace and Lenity to remit the one half of that ancient Severity commonly submitted unto in the earlier days of Christian Religion. And who but ignorant and ill natur'd and nurtur'd children, could turn her Lenity into Tyranny, and make her curtesie a matter of calumny? Nay, (which hath more dissingenuity and absurdity) while they fret and complain grievously that the Yoke, as it is, lyes too heavy upon them, and presses them too hard, to invert their spite and malice against it, by arguing from the lightness and contemptibleness of such Fastings, as consists only in abstinence from flesh: saying, It is no Fast which abstains not absolutely from all Meat. This were indeed somewhat to the purpose, if so be that the Church did at the same time command any man to eat fish, or so much as hearbs or bread, when she forbids flesh to be eaten: Or that they, who were able and did wholly abstain from Meats at such seasons, did not more fulfill the intention of the Church, then they who took the liberty left them of eating in some manner. What temper and spirit do these men discover to themselves to be of, who are alwayes in readiness to charge their Superiours, either with folly, or tyranny, or impiety, upon the same occasion, and never been able to prove any one them? *Scotus* and *Biel* after him, distinguish of a Fast of *Nature*, which is a total abstinence from all eating and drinking, and of a Fast of the *Church*, when a man eats but once a day, and that according to the precept and mind of the Church. Now if the Church hath invented a favourable distinction and sense to gratifie murmurers at the rigour of her Laws, do they not requite her ingenuously, who turn that also to her reproach? Nay, if another distinction be found, which makes a Fast a *Toto*, a *Tanto*, and a *Tali*, from the *Whole*, from the *Quantity*, and from the *Quality* of the Meats eaten, hereby willing to condescend and bring down her Rules so low, that all men may have somewhat to exercise themselves in according to their ability, in the graces of Abstinence and Obedience; who but such, whose Religion impels them to be the worse for good usage, and resolve to hear of nothing but their own inventions, would clamour against their Governours for such moderation?

But when they are disappointed in their arguments and expectations to reduce all men and things to their own model, their last *Effort* is to humble this kind of Fasting into a civil Constitution only, and for a civil End, according as an Act of Parliament misconstrued (as hath more plainly and fully been declared by others) hath misled them: conceiv-

*Scotus*, lib. 4.  
Distinct. 8.  
*Biel* Lect. 8. in  
Canon Mist.

ing that the Fastings of our Church tend only to the encrease of Navigation, or are intended for the good of beasts, not of men. But what hinders that the Church may have one end in her decrees, and the Common-wealth another? and that which the Church designed for the exercise of Christian virtues, may be embraced by Secular Politicians, to promote Secular benefits to the Publick? Nothing is so manifest to him that knows any thing in Church History, as that such a reason was never dreamt of by the Propounders of such Fastings in our Church, nor in any part of the Christian world before that Act. And if the words of that Act were intended for an ease to the tender Consciences (as those of dissenters are mis-called) and to draw them by little and little, upon consideration of Civil ends, (which they less hated than the Ecclesiastical) to some good order and submission; this is not to be drawn to a perpetual Rule, nor made the only universal end of such a Constitution: For the Church still keeps to the most ancient and general sense received amongst Christians.

A third Precept of the Church is, *The Observation of the Ecclesiastical Customs and Ceremonies of the Church, and that without frowardness and contradiction*: as appears from her Canons and the Preface before the Common-Prayer: Of which obligation, that which we have before spoken of, the Power of the Church, and even now of Fasting, may here be applied, and suffice.

Canon 6. Preface of Ceremonies, &c.

A fourth Precept is, *Constantly to repair to the Publick Service of the Church for Mattens and Evening Song*, with other holy Offices, at times appointed: unless there be a just and unfeigned cause to the contrary: And this we have before also treated of: extending it to the worship of God in his House, especially when there is an assembly of Christian people together to that purpose, though there be no Sermon: and also to the humbling a mans self, and putting up his private Devotions there alone, when occasion and opportunity shall be offered so to do, according to the most ancient and godly custom of good Christians, ever since there were Temples built for Gods Service: For the disuse of which excellent acts, not the least reason hath been, or can be alledged by those that would be thought to be the only Rule of Reformation, which we have not sufficiently refuted before.

Preface to the Book of Common-Prayer.

Lastly, *To receive the blessed Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ, with frequent Devotion, but at least Thrice a year, whereof Easter is to be one*: And in order hereunto, as occasion shall be, to open our souls by due Confession, and disburden and quiet our troubled Consciences by some learned and discreet Minister of God, from whom Ghostly counsel and comfort may be received, with the benefit of Absolution: Of the use of which we have also before spoken; where we shewed, that such Confession was not of such absolute Divine Right either of Precept or Means, that Salvation could not be otherwise obtain'd: but as an Ecclesiastical Expedient very effectual, as well for the bringing Impenitent sinners to repentance, as for the due restoring of them that are Penitent, to a comfortable assurance of Gods favour towards them; and direction and encouragement in holy living, which the foul abuses in those Churches, where it is excessively magnified, should by no means abolish. For besides them above noted, doubtless it is no mean abuse to make that, which undoubtedly should be an act of Judgment in Gods Minister, discerning between the hopeful state of some, and desperate of others, and accordingly suspending or applying the Free Grace of the Gospel, and the Power left by Christ to his

Second Exhortation to be read before the Communion.



Church, an act of custom, formality, and course, or, perhaps, common civility : which kind of rashness and profuseness the ancient Churches were altogether ignorant of. When grievous offenders against God and the Church had fallen justly under the censures of the Church, it was permitted to absolve them at the point of death, so far as concerned their restitution to the Communion of the Church, before they departed this life ; but not so far, as to remit the offences against God ; or that, without actual demonstrations of their hearty sorrow for their sins, and steadfast purposes and professions of future amendment, they should have pronounced over them the Absolution of all their sins, and that, perhaps when they could no more desire, than deserve such a Sentence.

## CHAP. XIX.

*A Preparation to the Explication of the Decalogue, by treating of Laws in General. What is a Law? Several kinds of Laws. Of the obligation of Laws from Justice, not Force only. Three Conditions required to obliging. Of the Ten Commandments in special. Their Authour, Nature, and Use.*

Exod. 34. 28.  
Deut. 4. 13.  
according to  
the Hebr. and  
Septuag. And  
Josephus Anti-  
quities. l. 4. c. 8  
ἡ δὲ νόμος  
appellat.

**B**UT because a general Opinion, as well amongst Christians as Jews, hath prevailed, that those Ten Commandments, or, as they are otherwise called, *Ten Words*, which God spake to the Children of Israel by *Moses* on Mount *Sinai*, are an absolute *Compendium* and *Rule* of Obedience to God, as well in our immediate Service towards him, as our mediate, in our duty towards our Neighbour, a brief inquiry into the Decalogue will neither be unseasonable nor impertinent : and the better to accomplish this, first to speak of Laws in General, before we treat of these more signal and eminent Laws of God.

*A Law* then (to begin with the Definition) seems to be nothing else, but *The rational and just will of a Sovereign Power, declared and manifested to its Subjects, for the better informing, directing, and regulating them according to truth and justice.* This Description, though I find not entirely and absolutely in others, yet is found in its several parts of which it consisteth, in divers Authours : and comprehends not only Humane, but Divine Laws, equally ; and not only written, but unwritten also : For it were a very fond and weak imagination in a man to conceive that the Writing, Printing, or Craving in Stone (as the Ten Commandments are said to be) can contribute any thing toward the force and due vigour of a Law, any further than

than that thereby it becomes better known to all therein concerned. Promulgation indeed is essential to all Laws, but the Promulgation or Publication by the foresaid means, is not so: but any other notice given thereof may suffice. But while a thing lyes hid in the mind and breast only of the proper Legislatores or Governours, it cannot, in reason, obtain the nature or force of a Law: but then only it doth, when it either is known, or might, and ought to be known, according to the manner of publication. And this *declared will* must not be the act of any inferiour or subordinate person, who of himself hath no right to will or require the observation of his Dictates or Orders, but of the Supream, originally at least, though not immediately. The universal and absolute Sovereign of all things is God alone: and his Power alone, and right of Dominion (of which we have spoken in the beginning) abundantly suffices to justify all demands of service and obedience from his Creatures, and that according to his absolute will, without any exception or limitation; it being intrinsically good, whatever shall appear to be the Will of God, even because it is the Will of God, who is nothing but Goodness in the most absolute sense.

And hence it is that notwithstanding Laws are divided into *Divine, Humane, and Ecclesiastical*: yet in truth, and upon due search, it will be found that they all are Divine really, though not formally, and mediately, though not immediately: as *Tully* excellently, and little less than divinely, hath defined, saying; *A Law is nothing else but right Reason drawn from the Gods themselves, commanding honest things, and forbidding the contrary*: And to the same effect writeth *Clemens Alexandrinus*, and *Hierocles* saying, *Law is that Operative mind and Divine will, which perpetually advances and preserves all things*. So that whatever Law, be it Civil or Ecclesiastical, which can not draw in some remote manner at least, its descent from Heaven and God Almighty, is not just or reasonable, and by consequence, not properly a Law, but the private Lust of Tyrants.

But then in deducing Laws of Humane birth from God, there must not be such a rigorous course taken, as that whatever is not contained expressly in his revealed Word, or obvious to the eye of Nature, should be condemned as spurious and illegitimate, and having no right to oblige men to observance and submission thereunto: For some things are more clearly, and some more obscurely; some things more nearly, and some more remotely, deducible from their first fountain: some Laws natural (and the like may be said of Divinely revealed, and Ecclesiastical) are sufficiently apparent to all, or most, intelligent men, as just and reasonable; others (as *Thomas* hath observed) are evident so to be, to the more understanding and searching Wits: this being to be received as a plain and undoubted Rule in doubtful Cases, that the professed Authours and Interpreters of Laws are generally better seen into the Natural, Divine, and Moral reason and obligation of a Law, and the common benefit and expedience thereof, than inferiour and ignorant persons, who are prone to judge of the reasonableness and usefulness of it, as it best agrees with their own private judgments, none of the certainest; or Interests, none of the justest many times, not considering, which is most necessary, the common good claiming prerogative above particular: So that there can be no more unnatural Rule than that

necessarily and probably following of the Law of Reason, and of the Law of God — And therefore in every Law Positive well made, is somewhat of the Law of Reason and of the Law of God, and to discern the Law of God and the Law of Reason from the Law Positive, is very hard. *D. H. W. and Student, c. p. 4.*

*Lex est nihil aliud nisi rectitudo a numine deorum tractata ratio, imperans honesta, prohibens contraria.* Cicero Philipp. II. Clem. Alex. Strom. l. 1. p. 350.

*Νόμος μὲν ἔστιν ὁ διανοητικὸς νόμος καὶ ὁ δὲ βέλτης, ὁ αὐτὸς παρὰ πάντα, καὶ οἱ αὐτοὶ διασώζουσι.* Hierocles in Carm. Pyth.

*Πᾶς νόμος ψυχικὸς καὶ διὰ τὸν Θεόν.* Demosthen. in Arist.

The Law of Man (which sometimes is called the Law Positive) is derived by reason, as a thing which is ne-

which would have every man a Law, and Rule, and Reason to himself; or definitively and finally to judge for, and of himself in all things, what is just and reasonable: This is altogether lawless, and repugnant to the revealed Will of God, which hath ordained several orders and ranks of men, whereof some are to be in Power and Authority, others in subjection and obedience.

And from hence it proceedeth that Magistrates, who are the only Lawgivers, and true Interpreters of Laws given, have had somewhat more of the Image of God ascribed to them than other common men: because, as it is Gods primary power and prerogative to give Laws to all the world, as his Subjects, so is it the undoubted Right of lawful Governours under God, to propound and impose Laws serviceable to the common ends of such a Society as thereby is disposed and regulated.

And there are three things principally requisite to make a Law obligatory upon men: The first is taken from the Person *Giving* or propounding this Law, and that is Authority: without which the best Laws that can be invented are directly tyrannical and unjust; as well in respect of the Person, whose Right is thereby invaded and usurped (so that Conscience is so far from being obliged by it, that rather it is bound to oppose and resist such Laws, though in themselves very profitable and reasonable, because they imply a wrong to another, to whom only pertaineth the Legislative Power) as of the persons *to whom* such goodly Laws are given, because thereby is an unjust service and bondage brought upon them. But no man can be bound to this double injury, though peradventure such a Case may be put in, which to decline a greater evil and mischief, a man may be patient and passive under such usurpers. A second thing is taken from the *matter* and nature of the Law it self, which, if it be not just and reasonable, bindeth not the Conscience, though enacted by Authority altogether lawful and unquestionable: The reason whereof is that so often abused place of holy Writ, which adviseth to *obey God rather than men*. Gods eternal and indispensable Law exacteth of man due observation, and that chiefly upon account of his absolute Sovereignty and Dominion, which no inferiour Power ought to controul, or can make void. But should any mortal man command contrary to God, it could signifie nothing more then the folly of his own heart, and the distemper of his mind, and a foul revolt and defection in him that should suffer himself to be so abused. But is there no difference (think we) between the Powers on earth acting quite contrary to God, and such as only want *special* warrant for what they sometimes expect from their Subjects? The ignorance or wilful negligence of this distinction or notion is it which hath hurried men into so many unchristian acts, and made such havock, especially in Religion. A third principal ingredient into a Law is that taken from the Persons to whom it is made: not that they must owe obedience unto the Lawgiver (though that be true) for this is the very same with the first: For wherever there is the first part of the Relation, there must also of necessity be the second: and so, wherever there is Power and just Authority to command and rule, there must necessarily be a duty of obedience in others: but knowledge and manifestation of a Law (before touched) is absolutely requisite to bind people to the observation of it. And yet I mean not actual and inevitable knowledge, but possible, and ordinarily attainable: it being most certain, that the same persons who stand generally obliged to observe a Law made and propounded, are likewise bound to take notice of its promulgation: and this neglecting, subject themselves to the like penalties as the wilful Violators of it.

There



There may well be added unto these three, a Fourth Condition to the validity of a Law, and that is *Power*. How Power and Authority differ is not unknown, *viz.* that the first consists in sufficient strength and force to constrain obedience, or inflict the punishment denounced against disobedience, not necessarily inferring Right so to do: And this is not intrinsecal to a Law, because it is only to be exercised as a necessary instrument, subservient to the ends of Right and Justice preceeding, which is Authority properly so called; which duly exercised, doth oblige without force to submission, and that out of Duty and Conscience, as appeareth from what we have said already in the First Book of the First Part of this Treatise. Now though this Power be not intrinsecal to the *Obligation* of a Law, as some unnatural Philosophers have of late days imagined, and boldly and basely endeavoured to maintain, yet may it be essential to the *Execution* of the same; Men being generally so unreasonable and averse to Order and Government, and the publick Good, when no special and immediate advantage accrues to their particular person, that without the iron rod to constrain, the Majesty of the Scepter will not sway them: And but that I have found such prodigious tenets in the writings of late Politicians, denying all Justice and Conscience, and destroying them as far as their blind and pestilent wits will enable them (which certainly they never shall, any more than to destroy God himself, and extinguish the notion of a Deity out of the minds of men) I should have thought that for want of such a distinction between the *Obligation* and *Execution* of a Law, they fell into such flat and portentous errors: For what doth argue greater stupidity, than to conclude there is no necessity (of violence) this should be done, therefore it ought not to be done? Or because that man is impious, who, because he is strong enough to be successful, scruples not at all to invade and prey on another: and he may become ridiculous that commandeth without any ability or probability of effecting what he requireth; therefore no obligation lyes on the persons to whom he directs himself to obey. *Aristotle* indeed tells us of a Law that the Hares should make in their solemn Assemblies, that all beasts should share alike in the earth, but at this (said *Antisthenes*) the Lyons laughed: and well they might, when such Laws proceeded from them, who had neither Right to make, nor Power to enforce them; but where there is Right without Might, the matter is more to be abhorred on the one side, than decided on the other.

*Arist. Politic.*  
l.3. c.4. §.78.

True it is that *Marfilus Patavinus* does make Coaction an ingredient into the definition of a Law: and that not amiss, if we consider that definitions of things are to be made according to the *Habitude* of things, rather than *Actualness*; and so this his definition is very good: *A Law properly taken is a Coactive Precept of doing or omitting humane acts, under punishment to be inflicted on transgressors.* For though a Prince deprived of Power makes Laws which he is not able to enforce, or the Church, yet while indelible Right to Power resides with him as an *Habitude*, the Law is of force, and is of a Coactive nature, though not actuated.

*Lex proprie sumpta, Preceptum coactivum est, de faciendis aut omitendis humanis actibus, sub poena transgressoribus infligenda. Marfilus Patavinus de Jurisdictione Matrimoniali*

And this being not unduly, as we hope, premised, we now proceed to the explication of that particular Law of God, called the *Decalogue*: which though it branches it self into ten parts, yet, according to the Jews not amiss conceiving, is but One Law, as proceeding from one Fountain, pronounced in one breath, say they, engraven or written as one Line or Word on two Tables, and hanging all on one string, *Charity*: which (saith *St. Paul*) is the fulfilling of the Law, as many Beads or Jewels make but one Bracelet.

Yet

Origen. Hom.  
1c. super Ex-  
od. Non ut  
simplicioribus  
videtur, cuncta  
quæ statimantur  
Lex dicitur,  
&c.  
Plal. 19. 7. 8.

Sunt autem  
partes Legis  
hujus [Dei]  
septem, quarum  
prima est Te-  
stimonia, &c.  
Gul. Parisiens.  
de Legibus,  
cap. 1.

Yet according to the several forms and distinct matter are they often distinguished; as by *Origen* in these words: *It is not* (as may seem to the simpler sort) *that all things that are constituted are the Law [Lex] but some truly are called Law, some Testimonies, some Commands, some Righteousnesses, some Judgments, which the 18 (or 19) Psalm plainly teaches us, saying, The Law of the Lord is a perfect Law converting the soul: the Testimony of the Lord is sure, making wise the simple. The Statutes of the Lord are right, rejoicing the heart: the Commandment of the Lord is pure, enlightning the eyes.* Neither doth *Gulielmus Parisiensis* much vary from his sense, who makes seven Parts of the Law of God: the First whereof is *Testimonies*, and these are of Truths, and therefore to be believed: The Second, *Commands*, and these are of Honest things, and therefore to be fulfilled: The Third, *Judgments*, and these are of Equity, and therefore to be obeyed: The Fourth, are *Examples*, and these are to be imitated: The Sixth is *Threatnings*, to wit of Punishments, and these are to be feared. The Seventh are *Ceremonies*, and these are to be revered and *observed*: Thus he. But whether these do not concern rather the whole Body of the Law, than the Decalogue in particular, may justly be doubted, but shall not here be disputed: though upon this account it may seem to concern this also: For if the *Ten Commandments* be the sum of the whole Law of *Moses*, as is credibly taught, how can it so be, unless it virtually comprehends the several distinct parts thereof? which will be farther cleared in the brief consideration of these three Particulars concerning the Decalogue. 1. The Institution of this Law. 2. The Nature or Use of it: and Thirdly, The Explication of it.

The Authour and Institutour of this Law was infallibly God himself, as of all the Writings of *Moses*, the *Prophets*, *Evangelists*, and *Apostles* received amongst us for Canonical: But whether there were any more immediate act of God, and, as I may say, personal, in delivering these Commands, than in communicating his will by *Moses* to the Israelites upon other occasions, is not so well resolved. The Learned of the Jewish Doctours do put a distinction between the Divineness of the Pentateuch wrote by *Moses*, and the rest of holy Scripture of the Old Testament, making that the Ground and Rule, as it were, of other propheticall Writings: and so do many suppose the Law to be more Sacred than the other parts of Scripture; and to be more Sacred, because more solemnly and formidably, and with greater manifestation of Gods Glory and Majesty delivered to *Moses*; yea, and because written with the finger of God himself, as the Scripture witnesses: which seems to speak as if God herein had not used the ministry of Angels, as at other times, and upon other occasions, but spake and acted immediately in his own person. *These words* (saith *Moses* in *Deuteronomy*) *the Lord spake unto all your assembly in the Mount, out of the midst of the fire, of the cloud, and of the thick darkness, with a great voice, and he added no more, and he wrote them in two Tables of Stone, and delivered them to me.* And when the people in *Exodus* beg of *Moses*, saying, *Speak thou with us and we will hear thee, but let not God speak with us lest we dye*: it seems to imply that God himself was the speaker. Nay, God saith afterward, *Ye have seen that I have talked with you from heaven*: And to this effect the holy Scripture elsewhere, as *Deut. 4. 36. Nehem. 9. 13. Deut. 5. 4. Exod. 33. 11.* from all which there is nothing more certain then that the voice was sensible, and after humane manner audible; contrary to some Jews, who, as *Buxtorf* tells us, presume to say, it was imaginary only.

And

And what do not the Jews superstitiously devise to magnifie this Law, and by implication, themselves above other people, so favoured by God? For they not only say, that God, with his own mouth, spake these *Ten Words*, but with his own hands made the two Tables, as may be seen in *Buxtorf*: and amongst others, *Rabbi Simeon* writes, That *both Tables were created by God immediately, and that before the world began*, not regarding how contradictory to Scriptures such an assertion is, *Exod.* 34. 1, 2, 3, 4. and *Dent.* 10. 1. which they would understand only of the *Second Tables*, but without reason.

*Buxtorf. de  
Decalogo.*

But if we consider first, how dubiously and ambiguously the word, *God*, is used in Scripture, signifying *Angels* often, and sometimes *Men* of Renown and Command; and the *Finger of God*, to be the same sometimes with the *Spirit of God*, sometimes with the *Power of God*, *Exod.* 8. 19. *Luke* 11. 20. And secondly, That then, according to our apprehension and the Scriptures phrase, God is said to do a thing himself, when he doth it, not by any humane instrument or help, though he employeth invisible Spirits therein, there will be no such necessity of Consequence as may seem at first view: and thus *Calvin* upon these words of *Exod.* 31. 18. interprets the matter, not amiss.

And if we consider, secondly, what sense the Writers of the New Testament take them in, the other opinion which holds that these Commands were delivered by the mediation of Angels, will appear most probable: For so saith *St. Stephen* expressly in the *Acts*, to the Jews; *Who received the Law by the disposition of Angels, and have not kept it.* And *St. Paul*, *It was ordained by Angels in the hands of a Mediatour.* And in the Epistle to the *Hebrews* it is called, *The word spoken by Angels.* Some may say here, That by *Law* is here to be understood, not the *Decalogue* only, but the whole Law of *Moses* at the least: which cannot be absolutely denied, though the contrary seems most probable: But if it be so, does not the whole include the parts? If the Law in general was so dispensed, does it not follow that this Law in particular was so ordained? Though if it be granted that this Law particularly was so delivered, it doth not follow that the whole Law of *Moses* was so given by the ministry of Angels, and not only by Divine inspiration, without any Angels officiating towards it, as in this Case we suppose. And *Perkins* on the *Galatians* affirmeth directly, that this Law was given by the ministry of Angels.

*Acts* 7. 53.  
*Gal.* 3. 19.

*Perkins Gal.*  
3. 19.

And to confirm this, I shall adde a Scholastical Reason: For if it be true what *St. John* saith, that *No man hath seen God at any time*; and what the Schools teach (as I believe) that fleshly eyes cannot possibly discern God immediately; may we not much more truly say, that we cannot hear Gods voice with our fleshly ears and live, any more than see God and live? But God says expressly, *No man shall see me and live.* But as God maketh certain representations of himself to our eye, which are not himself, but yet bear his name in Scripture, so God produceth, or causeth to be produced, audible sounds, which are not really and properly his voice, yet represent so much to the ear of man; which when it comes attended with more than natural, or ordinary circumstances (as did the voice at the giving of the Law) it is more especially and signally ascribed unto God as his.

*John* 1. 18.

*Exod.* 33. 20.

Lastly, It is said in *Exodus*, that *Moses wrote upon the Tables the words of the Covenant, the Ten Commandments*, which in the beginning of the Chapter, God is said to write, *I will write upon these Tables the words that were in the first, &c.* which moved the Fathers, as *Cyprian* and *Austin*, whom *Lyra* follows,

*Exod.* 34. 28.

*Exod.* 34. 1.



follows, to understand them so that God wrote *Autoritatively*, and *Moses Ministerially*. But later Jewish and Christian Expositours have thought good rather to refer the later part of these words, *And he was there with the Lord forty dayes and forty nights, he did neither eat bread nor drink water: and he wrote upon the Tables the words of the Covenant, the Ten Commandments*, to God, not without some violence to the sense, more current otherwise: But in such variety and obscurity as is here, I see no remedy but men must judge for themselves.

Buxtorf. in  
Decalog.  
num. 51.  
*Præcis temporibus, &c.*

However, I suppose the second thing propounded, is from hence competently clear, concerning the Nature of this Law: That as it is undoubtedly Divine, so from the Authority delivering it, it hath no more force or obligation upon us, than other words of God extant in holy Scripture. Nor is it easily to be conceived, how any thing can be said to be more or less divine, which is acknowledged to come from God, by vertue of any manner of delivering it, whether mediately or immediately, by a still and quiet inspiration, or by a publick and majestick declaration; but from the matter it may: And *Buxtorf* in his forementioned Treatise on the Decalogue hath these words; *In ancient times it was a custome among the Jews, that the Decalogue should every day in the Morning Prayers be publicly and privately rehearsed and repeated—— This laudable custome, in latter times, they have abolished: the reason whereof the Talmud renders to be, lest the people should believe that the Decalogue had any more divineness in it than other parts of Scripture.* From whence we may observe, First, That anciently the Jews had a constant Form of Worship. Secondly, That there is no such ridiculousness in Prayers publick and private, to repeat the Creed and Ten Commandments, as certain pretenders to giftedness have presumed. Thirdly, That the Jewish Doctours discerning the great inconvenience that might happen from admitting degrees of Sacredness in Divine Revelations, chose to prevent such errors, by taking away the presumed occasion: For however some have distinguished between Divine Right and Apostolical, making this a mean between humane purely, and divine; yet in propriety of speech all Constitutions are either divine purely, or purely humane. And therefore Apostolical Right can be no more than humane Right, when it is distinguished from Divine.

This we speak of Constitutions taken in their formality, not as oftentimes they are used, for the things themselves so ordained. For no doubt but as there are degrees of sins against Laws, so these degrees are estimated from the weightiness or lightness of the matter against which offences are committed. And thus we may hold that the Ten Commandments are more Sacred, that is, contain more important matters than generally the rest of the Scriptures do, that is again, in the like number of words, being certainly the most perfect and plain, and compendious form of serving God that the Jews had any where revealed unto them, if not a more absolute sum of our practical duties towards God and Man, then we find collected together in so few words in the Gospel; and therefore not unworthily inserted into the Second part of the Office of our Church.

But whether this *Decalogue* was ever intended by God, as such a perfect and compleat Rule of Obedience, that nothing to which Jew or Christian was obliged, hath escaped it, may well be question'd: understanding the Question not so much of ceremonial or extrinsecal Duties of Religion, as moral and perpetual.

Many have this last age brought forth, who though they look upon it little less than ridiculous to make any use of the Ten Commandments in our worship of God, yet ascribe so great perfection to it as a Rule, that they suppose they have convinced you of absurdity enough, if they drive you to either of these straits, To deny any Moral duty to be contained in the Decalogue, or to affirm any Ceremonial to be therein included: For then they loudly cry concerning the First, you make the Law of God an Imperfect Rule: And concerning the Second, (as by name doth Dr. Twisse, in his Treatise on the Sabbath, with innumerable others) If, for instance, the Fourth Commandment be not Moral, what doth it among the Ten Commands? And having said this, they need (they think) say no more, to confound their adversaries.

To the former therefore we say that improving the Art of Reduction to the height, no doubt but all Moral and Ceremonial duties too, may be reduced to some of the Ten Commandments. For if our Saviour Christ our Great and Infallible Master reduced these Ten to two: and again, all things contained in the Law and Prophets (which must be all Moral duties) to Love of God and Love of our Neighbour, in St. *Matthew's* Gospel, saying, *On these two Commandments hang all the Law and the Prophets*: Nay, and which is yet more, St. *Paul* brings all Christian duties under one Head of Love, saying, *Love is the fulfilling of the Law*. Do we wonder at, or can we censure those who would have all Christian virtues included, and vices and sin excluded by the Decalogue? But surely, they who contend for such a comprehension as may be useful to a man, do not intend that it self should be incomprehensible and illimited; which at this rate, it must be, reducing every thing to any thing: but certain Rules have been invented for the limiting and directing of men in this matter; which being not taken from the Reason of the thing it self so much, as the Arbitrary wit of the Contrivers of them, may as well (as many other things) be refused at pleasure, as an humane Invention: For mine own particular, I think *Erasmus* has spoken judiciously and truly in the Case: *Here I see some labouring hard to reduce all Precepts, whether commanding or forbidding, to these Ten: and to refer the seven deadly sins to some of these, but with diligence more sedulous than serious*: And no other instance needs be given of an incapacity in the Decalogue of Regular reduction of this nature, than what *Thomas* has given us, whose Logical head was able to do as much in this kind as any mans; Framing an Objection to himself, that Gluttony was no mortal sin, because it was not contrary to any of the Ten Commandments, answers thus: *Gluttony is a mortal sin, in as much as it averts us from the Ultimate end: and according to this, by a Certain Reduction* [by which every thing may be reduced to every thing] *is opposed to the Command of Sanctifying the Sabbath, in which is required our rest in the Ultimate End*. If this be fair, and allowable, what needed we any more Commandments than that of keeping holy the Sabbath day? For surely, all sin, as well as Gluttony turns us away from our Last End, which is God; and our resting in him: and therefore, by this reason, all sin should be Sabbath-breaking. St. *James* indeed saith, *Whosoever shall keep the whole Law, and yet offend in one point, he is guilty of all*; that is, a breaker of all. But he very well explains himself immediately after, that he meant not so much in respect of the matter of the Law, that a man could not sin against it in one case, but he must sin against it in another; but in respect of the Manner. For, saith he, *He that said unto thee do not commit adultery, said also do not kill, &c.* implying

S f

thus

Matth. 22. 37.  
38. 39. 40.

Rom. 13. 10.

*Hic video quosdam in hoc elaborasse, ut universa precepta sive iubentia, sive vetantia ad hæc decem redigant: Et Capitalium peccatorum species quæ septem numerantur, in aliquod horum referunt: sed sedulâ diligentia magis quam serid. Erasmus. Cateches. 6. in Decal. Thom. 22. qu. 148. 2. ad 1.*

James 2. 10.

thus much, that the same evil mind that disposes a man to disobey God in one point of the Law, will incline him to the like in others: and the Cords of Fear and Love of God being broken, to offend God in one sin, leave him at liberty to offend him in any other whatever. Not that a man doth directly or actually commit sin against the whole Law: As in the case of Moral Vertues, according to Philosophers, all are so connected and dependent upon one another in Prudence, that whoever wants that, lies open to all vices. But our enquiry is concerning the connexion of vertues and vices in the matter of them; whether the offender in one sin, is guilty of all: whether the Drunkard be a Thief, or the Sabbath-breaker an Adulterer: For according to the large extent of Rules commonly given, either of these may be made good: and without such a latitude, drunkenness will hardly find a proper place in any of the Ten Commandments, unless we say, as some more wittily than solidly, *Drunkenness staggers through all the Commands*: And in the like sense, What sin doth not? And therefore *Thomas* is constrained to acknowledge, that *Not all Mortal sins are directly contrary to the Precepts of the Decalogue, but those only which contain injustice: because the Precepts of the Decalogue in especial manner pertain to Justice, and the parts thereof.*

Thom. ibid.

Novatianus  
Epist. de Judaicis (apud  
Tertul.) cap.  
3. Denique &  
decem sermones  
illi in tabulis  
nihil novum  
docent,  
&c.  
Grot. in Decalogum.

Sixt. Sen. Bib.  
1.4.

That so many Ancient, as well as Modern Doctors of Christs Church have endeavoured to bring all Sins, and Graces, and Duties to the Ten Commandments, I take to proceed from this three-fold cause. First in Imitation of the Jews, who agreed with Christians in the Use of the Decalogue, as being no more than a restoring the decayed Law of Nature in man, and reprinting it in his mind: as well hath Novatianus observed thus, *Lastly those ten sayings in Tables teach no new thing; but what was blurred, they admonish: that Justice contained in them, as fire buried, might, as it were, by the breath of the Law be re-enchanted.* And Philo testifieth of the Jews not only of his Times, but ancients, that they were wont to reduce All the Precepts of *Moses* his Law to these Ten: not that they did believe that they were all contained in them, as *Grotius* hath observed: but that those things we have here, belong to such general heads of Actions, unto which for memory sake others may be reduced; in like manner as Philosophers are wont to reduce all things to *Aristotles Ten Categories* or *Predicaments*, (though by the way it is observed by *Sixtus Senensis*, out of ancient Authors that *Aristotle* was not the true Author of the Ten Predicaments, but rather *Architas Tarentinus*.) And this Christians did more accurately, as being better endowed with the Holy Spirit, and obliged to higher vertues. A second reason might be, for that the Decalogue (as we have already said) though it be not such an exquisite and ample Rule as to contain all things, without great straining and force, yet it being the most significant is any where extant in Scripture, Christians chose that for their *Compendium*: to which other duties might relate. And this, Thirdly, because of the expediency of advancing some one Form of Words to be a Rule of Practice, as were the Creed and Lords Prayer instituted, as Forms of Faith and all Prayers: and that chiefly for help to the Memory of men in their compleat duty towards God and Man. The first that I have observed who brought this way of Reduction of all things to the Commandments, was *St. Hieromne*, who hath delivered such General Rules for this purpose, as have been much improved and multiplied by many Catechises and Commentators upon them. To which I shall refer the Reader at present: passing, or rather passing from the Use in General, to the Particular Use of it in the Third thing, viz. The Explication,

CHAP.



## C H A P. XX.

*Of the Ten Commandments in Particular ; and  
their several sense and importance.*

**I**N all Laws three things are to be considered, saith a late excellent person in the Civil Law ; The Preface, the Law it self, and the Epilogue, or Conclusion to it, or Sanction : And these are all found in the Decalogue. And where some have no special Preface, there the General Prologue is to be current, and applyed unto them. And so where other particular precepts want the enforcement of them in the conclusion, they may well borrow it from some other : as for Example, *I am the Lord thy God*, set before all the Commandments, ought to have the same influence upon all, as upon the first : And so that in the end of the Second, *For I the Lord thy God am a jealous God, and visit the sins of the Fathers upon the Children, unto the third and fourth Generation of them that hate me, and shew mercy unto them that love me and keep my Commandments*, is of force upon all the other Commandments, exacting obedience to each in particular, under the like Promises upon obedience ; and Judgments upon disobedience.

Concerning the division or disposition of the Ten Commandments in the Decalogue, because the disputation about that conduces but little to the benefit of the curious enquirer, I shall not insist on it ; only premise a caution against superstitious adhering to any one Faith in the case : For the truth is, It matters not how they are numbred, provided that we loose not of their number : in which case the modern Romanists, with great impudence, offend in *expurging* the Decalogue it self, and *expurging* the Second Commandment. Their Apology or Excuse is no less presumptuous and pernicious, and to be had in more detestation than the Fact. Better a great deal they had so done, and given no reason at all, or their Common one, *That we must not enquire into the Acts of our Superiours*, and especially of the Infalible Church of Rome, than to bring such a reason as may justify them, or any body else in taking away half a dozen more Precepts out of the Decalogue : For doubtless (as hath been said) the vertue of those Ten Commands may be contained in a less number than they are : Shall we therefore implicitly, at least, tax Gods Spirit of *tautologie* and superfluity, and mend what it hath unartificially delivered unto us ? But it is well they can endure to leave them in their Bibles, as they find them. For surely they must either deny themselves or the Reasons why they leave it out of their Catechises and Books of Devotion ; that I mean especially which tells us, *It is contained in the First* : though the true reason perswades them otherwise, viz. lest the Second Command standing inviolate as God ordained, should be an offense and stumbling-block to the weak and unlearned : And there is no danger in it, standing where they neither must nor can come at it, in the Bible. But why may not weak and ignorant people understand that Commandment as well as the others, which are no plainer at all then that ? The truest answer is, Lest they stumble so as to fall into an inevitable truth, And

*Die mihi Philosophaster*  
[Gretzere] *si*  
*non tres Legum*  
*partes a summis*  
*Philosophis,*  
Platone, Pos-  
sidonio, Cice-  
rone, & alijs  
constituuntur,  
nempe Proemi-  
um, Lex ipsa,  
& Epilogus : si-  
ve sanctio.  
Goldastus  
Replicat. ad  
Gretz, c. 11.

whereas they adde farther, That it is Ceremonial: First we reply, That it is not ceremonial or proper to the Jews, as set down there entirely with its end and qualification, *Bowing down or Worshipping* any thing representing God, whether Image or Statue: and so the Eastern Churches alwayes did, and still do understand it of general and immutable nature, though they be too great admirers of Imagery otherwise. Again, if it were so peculiar to the Jews, as is vainly pretended, that they were to make no Images to themselves, is it also so proper to them (*Quarto modo*, as Logicians speak) that Christians are not capable of it, or must not take it in that sense also, if they please? It is granted lawful to Christians in a Civil sense, to use Images: but is it not also lawful for them to let them alone? Against what part of the Decalogue should they offend, yea, what any other part of Old or New Testament, if they refused to make any Images at all? Time certainly was, and that for Two Centuries together (notwithstanding some fabulous Records to the contrary) when Christians scrupuled to make any Image in order to any Religious use, though but to call to mind things Historically, or help Devotion: after many Centuries, they never farther used them than for meditation. And what one Precept of Gods Word would suffer by it, if they should have persevered in that simplicity to this day? I am sure many are violated by the illimited, or ill limited use of them. And now, what danger would the common sort run into, if such words had been found in their Books of Instruction, as the Second Commandment contains? Would they have fallen into Idolatry, the worst of all sins next Atheism, as by the confession and concession of divers of the soberer sort of Romanists, they do in the use of them? *Augustin* indeed comprehended the Second Commandment in the First, as they pretend towards their justification, but can they so much as pretend that he so reduced it to that, that he contented himself with the words only of the First, and left out, as insignificant or dangerous, the Second? No surely: For it is plain he joyned them entirely together: which, if Papists had done, they had herein little offended us: Yea, so far was St. *Augustine* from so doing, that on the contrary, in that Abbreviation he gives us of the Book of *Exodus*, he leaves out the First, viz. *Thou shalt have no other Gods but me*, and begins with this, *Thou shalt not make to thy self any graven Image, nor the likeness of any thing, &c.*

Augustinus  
in Speculo ex  
Exodo initio.

For, as I was saying, we are not such superstitious admirers of Numbers or Measures in these cases, that we would have contended so much as now, if they had made but Two Commandments of the Ten, provided they had given us the Substance of them without mutilation: but to make themselves more jealous for God than he is for himself, who here stileth himself a *jealous God*, is supream folly, and much worse.

The Scripture seems to divide the Commandments into two Parts, when it saith, that they were written in two Tables: as *Exod.* 32. 15. and 34. 1. and *Deut.* 4. 13. cap. 5. 22. and 10. 1, 4. But this doth not prove that they were so distinguished as many have imagined, that those duties which concerned the worship of God immediately, should be placed distinctly in one Table, and those which more immediately concern our Neighbour, should have another Table for themselves; as common Painters have contrived them. For in all probability, what was written Originally by God, was connected together so closely, that though there were Two Tables to contain all the Commandments, there was no such chasmes or distances left as are to be seen in the more modern distinction of the Scripture into particular

ricular Verses, but as it fell out, so the words proceeded from one Table to another, coheringly.

The Jews (as may be seen in *Philo Judæus* and *Josephus*) divided the Law into two equal Parts, not according to the matter respecting God and Man, but the manner or number, and made Five Precepts in One Table, and Five in the other. *Austine*, *Prosper*, and such as follow them, make but Three Precepts in the First Table, and Seven in the Second: But later Ages, not without the consent and concurrence of ancients, have from the matter it self, divided the Commandments so, that Four which relate principally to God, should be placed in the First Table, and Six in the Second: which seems to be most rational, though no less arbitrary than the other.

*Philo Jud. p. 579. Geneva. Joseph. Antiq. lib. 3, 4.*

There are likewise among the Jews who agree not in the very matter it self of the Ten Commandments: For some, as the Talmudists, and others following them, do make that we call properly The *Proem*, or *Preface*, *I am the Lord thy God*, to be part of the First Commandment, which is denied by *Aberbenel*, and others of them, as well as most of us. For this Proposition or Sentence, *I am the Lord thy God*, is, as we say, properly Enunciative, or Indicative, or purely affirmative, and not Imperative or Commanding, as all Precepts must be, which are so properly called.

The First Commandment therefore is this, *Thou shalt have no other Gods but me*. Where it is first to be observed, that almost thorow the whole Decalogue, some variety in words is to be found in *Exodus*, and in *Deuteronomy* the Fifth, where it is repeated. The Reason whereof *Grotius* thinks to be this, That here *Moses* did set down, or rather took precisely, what was spoken or written by the Angel: but in *Deuteronomy* he rehearseth the same himself, without such absolute Punctualities of words or expressions; and yet must we not dare to say, or believe that *Moses* transgressed his own Rule given by God in the Fourth Chapter before, *viz. Ye shall not add unto the word which I command you, neither shall ye diminish ought from it, that ye may keep the Commandments of the Lord your God which I command you*. So that it is a vain Scholie some would give us upon that, and such like Texts of Scripture, that nothing at all must be added to Gods word, more than we find the Letter to require. For undoubtedly such speeches mean no more than that we should do or say neither more or less to overthrow the intention of God in his Commandments. For otherwise, all the large and far fetched senses devised and applyed by the precise Masters and Mistakers of that Rule, to each particular Precept in the Decalogue, would be found either Superstitious or Sacrilegious inventions, though not inconsistent with the Analogy of Faith.

¶ I.

*Deut. 4.2.*

Furthermore, Laws are of two sorts generally, Affirmative or Negative. In the Negative (of which this is one) the ordinary method of explication, is, first to declare those sins of Commission which are prohibited: and then the Duties, Graces, and Vertues which are there implicitly required on the contrary: this being one general Rule of expounding the Decalogue, that where any vice or sin is forbidden, there the contrary vertue is commanded: And on the other side, Where any vertue or holy act is required, there the contrary vice or evil is interdicted. As for Example: Here it is forbidden, that we should have, or make, or worship any other God but the one true God; therefore on the contrary, there is an implicite injunction duly and faithfully to serve that one true God. And though the sense Negative is most current and general through the whole Decalogue, yet were the



the Affirmative duties they which God principally aimed at and intended. For *Negatives* do not make us holy to God in themselves, but only as they are necessary introductions, and good beginnings to the more perfect performance of *Positive* Duties. It would avail a man very little towards the fulfilling of this First Commandment, not to worship more Gods than one; for so he might worship none at all, and be a greater offender than the Idolater that worships many. We are therefore in the first place to enquire what are those Vertues and Graces God commands, and so shall we more readily and easily conceive what errors and sins we are hereby commanded to avoid. Some of both sorts we shall here instance in, to make more compleat that rude and imperfect account given above of the Acts of Obedience and Holiness owing from every good Christian to God; but as in a Table, rather than in a Treatise.

The Supposition then that this first Precept requires of us the true worship of God, doth infer all that train of Graces thereunto necessary; which are commonly reduced to these three Theological Vertues, Faith, Hope, and Charity. Of the nature of Faith, as well in General as Particular, have we spoken largely in the first Part: Yet rather in a speculative than practical or obediential way, which is proper to this place.

Rom. 10. 14.

Acts 19. 2.

2 Pet. 1. 5.

1 Pet. 2. 3.

1 Tim. 2. 4.

By the duty of Faith then, it is first required that we should have a competent knowledge of God and of his will; for some knowledge must of necessity go before Faith: There is a twofold knowledge: One of simple apprehension or intelligence; and this must go before Faith: *For how* (saith St. Paul) *shall they believe in him of whom they have not heard?* It is impossible a man should worship God before he believes there is a God: And impossible he should believe there is a God before he hath some notion or apprehension of a God, either by hearing, which is the ordinary way, or by some inward suggestion: And therefore we read that Paul inquiring of the Novices in Christianity at Ephesus, *Have ye received the Holy Ghost?* they answered, *We have not as yet heard whether there be an Holy Ghost, or no.* And there is another knowledge of Assurance; which assurance is caused in Humane Sciences by an orderly and necessary connexion of natural causes one with another, but in Divine matters, by Faith: which causes that, or greater perswasion than any outward artificial Demonstrations. And therefore, both the encrease of our knowledge, and the encrease and strengthening of our Faith, are much required by this Precept; according as we have the Scriptures more particularly advising us, and that by St. Peter: *And beside all this, giving all diligence, adde to your faith vertue, and to vertue knowledge, and to knowledge temperance, &c.* And so in his first Epistle, *Taste and see how good the Lord is:* And St. Paul to Timothy, *God will have all men to be saved, and to come to the knowledge of the truth:* And infinite other places.

Acts 9. 39.

Next to knowledge of God, seems to be the fear of God, according as the Scripture hath it: *And the Churches were edified, walking in the fear of the Lord.*

Next to Fear comes Repentance and Sorrow for sins past: then Renovation, or that properly called *Obedience*, in Newness of Life; with many others, not here to be insisted on.

The second Grace is Hope, which excites to walk and act according to the Gospel, from the consideration of the many Promises, and upon the intuition of an excellent reward, to follow certainly the fulfilling the will of God: Of which we have spoken, in treating of Gods works.

Lastly,

Lastly, Charity with its retinue of Divine Graces is required here also: as *1 John 4. 16. God is love, and he that dwelleth in love, dwelleth in God, and God in him: and Love is the fulfilling of the Law*, saith St. Paul. And the particular consequents and effects of Love are outward bounty towards Gods Worship and Service, towards his Servants and faithful Children; Zeal for the spiritual as well as temporal good of our Neighbour, and for the general glory of God, and the propagation of the true Faith; Defence of the Church; Reverence and Respect to his Officers and Ministers; Perseverance in well-doing; Constancy in the true Faith, even to suffering of reproaches, displeasures, contempts, indignities, and to suffer joyfully the spoiling of our Goods; and cheerfully the loss of our lives, by holy Martyrdom, for the love we bear to God in Christ: For as St. John saith, *Perfect love casteth out fear, because fear hath torment: he that feareth therefore is not made perfect in love*: that is, Love is of such a powerful nature, that where it is truly, there it overcometh all oppositions and difficulties which are apt to assail it, and fears nothing that may stand in its way, between Christ and it; or its duty, and God.

Hebr. 10. 34.

1 John 4. 18.

Now the contrary Vices to these, forbidden when it is said, *Thou shalt have no other Gods but me*, are Atheism, and contempt of all Divine Power, Disbelief, affected Ignorance of the true God and his Worship, or Superstition in multiplying Gods, either of equal, or inferiour order to God: Confederacies with the Devil, consulting with him, or any pretending to derive their art or skill from Evil Spirits: Seeking to any such for remedy or relief in losses, or sicknesses, or any such like distresses. And if any shall say, They can find no other remedies from some heavy Evils; they are to consider the excellent advice and exhortation of St. Chrysostome, to persevere notwithstanding in that condition it hath pleased God to bring them to, and so patiently resisting the temptation of such unlawful deliverance, they shall both suffer and be crown'd as Martyrs: For such were some of those Martyrs mentioned by St. Paul, *Not accepting deliverance*. Again, Carnal Security, Despair of Gods Grace and Mercy by Impenitence: Worldly mindedness, or any covetousness of the Creature, or the comforts of it above God, which is Idolatry: But more literally, Any more than Civil and Humane Worship given to any Creature whatever, though with real intentions to worship the true God only, when there are competent advises and means to discern the mistake. Now what are competent notices, is to be judged from the common Rule to other errors, as well as that of Idolatry. And therefore the modern Invention of *Hyperdoulia*, or service above that ordinarily competent to Creatures, is a manifest piece of Superstition, and that Idolatrous; it being not found out yet by the wit of man, to put any mean between Divine worship and Civil. For if by *Hyperdoulia* they mean a higher and nobler act of Service, than is given to other blessed Spirits besides the Virgin Mary, they must either mean Nobler and Higher in Kind or Degree: But there is no Kind betwixt that proper to God, which we call Divine; and that communicable to Creatures, which we call Civil and Religious, not for the acts sake whereby they are honoured by us, but for the ground and occasion of that act, viz. their Religion or Holiness. And if they mean, Higher degrees of worship of the same kind, then do they speak most absurdly and obscurely: because nothing can receive such degrees as to denominate it above its nature. And besides, degrees have respect not to the very thing it self, but to the quality of it. No man can say water is cold above cold, or fire is hot above the nature of heat: So can no man with

sense,

sense, if he means honestly, say, *Doulia* is to be above *Doulia*; or worship above worship: but must say, above such a proportion or degree of worship. But the first is absurdly, and the second wickedly said: for where such a general licence of service is allowed and given without any limits set, stinting and bounding the same, who there can stay his devotion from running out to extremity and all excess? *Hyperdoulia* therefore, or as I may render it, *Super service* doth naturally lead men to Idolatry, and that before they are aware. For if it be demanded, What mean you by this *Super-service*? Have they found out, as yet, any other description than that most ridiculous of defining a thing by it self; telling us, *Super-service* is that to be given to the Virgin *Mary* properly: and it being altogether as obscure, what is that reverence due to the Virgin *Mary* properly, How should we serve or worship her otherwise than we do other Saints or Angels? have they at all explained themselves otherwise than by this *Hyperdoulia* or *Super-service*? this say they, is due to her: but what this is, we are as far to seek as at the very first: Only we are sure of this, that by the term it self we may give her most properly Divine Worship, and be born out by that word. For it manifestly implyes somewhat exhibited above other Creatures, but nothing at all of the inferiourness of that service to that given to God: And therefore I see no reason to doubt, but this vile invention doth commonly end in Idolatry, and that against the first Commandment: Let us now proceed to the Second.

§. II.

The Second Precept in the Decalogue is, *Thou shalt not make to thy self any graven Image, nor the likeness of any thing, &c.* The true meaning of which can have, or need no better exposition than the general practise of the Popish Churches: For being resolved to hold to their corrupt way of making the Image of God, contrary to their Forefathers, who alwayes abhorred all representation of God, whether by Picture or Statue; and to their gross sense of giving reverence to that, and others of Saints and Angels, have laid this Precept aside, as being certainly inwardly convicted that it makes against them: as men are apt to turn those Servants or Children out of doors, who will not be kept in good order, or ruled by them; or wicked Subjects who turn their Sovereign out of his Place, his Throne, because he will not rule as they would have him; yet still perhaps will allow him the title of King, under confinement. This Commandment is not by them wholly cancell'd and rased out of Scripture, but it is kept under restraint, lest it should reduce Christians to its due Obedience. They say, It is the same in effect with the first, and contained in it: If so, why then do they not suffer it to speak and to bear its part in their Religious Books as well as the other? If it be not, why do they deny it its proper place and use? Surely, their reason at hand we cannot but accept as good and reasonable, viz. It may give offense to the people contrary to the use of that Church. And why so? Is it not because their doctrine and practise are quite contrary to it? Is it not because the native sense of those words is so manifest and obvious, that they would certainly understand them aright, could they be suffered to come to the true knowledge of them? And this is the scandal and offence would be given them. And in the Reign of *Henry* the Eighth of *England*, who opened the Hatches (a little) whereby men were kept in hold from discerning the clear light above and about them, when they could no longer conceal the Second Commandment from the people, but it must appear in its own entirenness, in the English tongue: *Gardiner* and other Romanists would have added for safety sake, their own gloss to the Word of  
of



of God, viz. to, *Thou shalt not make to thy self any graven Image, nor the likeness of any thing, &c. with that intent to give to them Divine Worship.* Which sufficiently betrays the guilt to which they are conscious in their false dealing with this Precept, and the common people about it.

But neither of these being likely to take effect, a more effectual and bold course is invented and defended, That this Commandment was Ceremonial and Judaical and Temporary; only ordained to prevent the Jews from falling into Idolatry, to which they were so prone. 'Tis true, they were so prone *then* to Idolatry; and however they are now-a-days more than enough averse from it, yet would they at this day be as prone as ever, were but the liberty given of the use of Images, in the sense of the Roman Church: This they have found by experience of their Forefathers, and others of succeeding Generations; and therefore hold it safest and best to set a less Superstition to keep at a distance, a far greater; and to make a scruple of all use of images (which can scarce amount to the nature of sin at all, though it may of folly) to secure themselves from the contagion of the other extrem in the superstitious use of them.

It is controverted between the ancient Hebrew Doctours (of which you may read *Petavius* and *Grotius*) whether Gods intent it was here wholly to deny the Jews the use of Images, as *Philo* and *Josephus* suppose, or the use only in a Divine manner, as others: this later Opinion is chosen by *Petavius* and the Adversaries to the Iconoclasts, or Image-breakers. But my opinion is, First, That all Jews concur in this, and all Christians, not led by the nose by the Pope of *Rome*, that to make the Image of God at all, under what pretence soever, is absolutely forbidden. And therefore I wonder more at *Gerson* than at them who lived with, and after him, that he should endeavour to excuse the Latin Church, thus: *Before the Incarnation, when the Law was given there appeared no Image of the Incorporeal God, either in wood or stone; because the Image of a Spirit cannot be made: And therefore all Images were then to be rejected: but because that may be now done, since the Incarnation of the Son of God, therefore from that time it is allowed to be done by him who might dispense:* Thus he. And how weakly, who may not see? First, Why could not the Image of God be made as well before the Incarnation as after? And why might not the Image of the Son of God be made before he was Incarnate, there being some knowledge of the same (as we may well suppose) amongst the Jews before the Incarnation, and some Umbrages and Representations of it in Apparitions made to the ancient Patriarchs, without the view of his Colour, Stature, and Lineaments, as well as after, when we have certainly lost the truest form of Christ? and go by guess and uncertain tradition? Again, could not there be drawn the Image of a Spirit before Christ, and can there now? I would fain see how? where? or by whom? What? Because Christ, who is a Spirit, who is God, may be drawn according to his Humane nature, may be also according to his Divine? The Divine Person may indeed, but the Divine Nature can no more now than before be resembled; and that Deity only by concomitance and implication, and not in format all. When the Image of a Man is made, the Image of him is made who hath a spiritual and divine Soul, but the Image of his Soul is not at all made: and much less is the Image of God made (unless metonymically, as Man is said to be the Image of God) when Christ is figured unto us. But could this be, which neither can, nor ought to be, what warrant at all can it be to make the Image of God in contradiction to Christ, as is pleaded for, and usual among Roman Catholicks? when they,

Antiquit. Brit.  
tan. pag. 338.

Petavius  
Theolog.  
Dogmat. To.  
4. l. 15. cap. 6.  
Grotius Ex-  
posit. Decal.

Gerson. To. 2.  
De 10 Præ-  
cept. in Præc.  
1.

upon a vile fanſie occaſioned from a viſion in *Daniel*, make God the Father, like a decrepit old man well clothed indeed, and moſt like to the Picture of Winter, we have ſeen, but that he wants a pan of coals by him, to warm his old and cold fingers over, and as it were his Grandchild ſtanding by him? Could not all this foul daubing of the Deity have been made before Chriſts Incarnation? Or ought it in any ſober mans judgment to be made now? Laſtly, becauſe they ſpeak of ſome ſpecial Diſpenſation to do this now, which was never allowed formerly, let them be ſo ingenuous and courteous to ſhow us, if not the Original (leſt they ſhould be conſented of it) the Copy, or but one word of it, and it will ſatisfie us; otherwiſe we think they have ſaid much more already than they needed: For we ſhould have been as well ſatisfied altogether if they had ſaid only, *It ought to be ſo*, as to give ſuch a Reaſon which is as incredible as the thing it ſelf, viz. that, *It is diſpenſed with now under the Goſpel*: Nay, in that they ſay, *it is diſpenſed with under the Goſpel*, they impy it was more than Moſaical and Ceremonial under the Law: becauſe Rites and Ceremonies are not ſo much diſpenſed with, as directly aboliſhed and deſtroyed.

Secondly, I hold it abſolutely forbidden the Jews by the ſame Law, to make uſe of any Images in the worſhip of God; though not to that degree as to worſhip them, but only, *By them*, and that for fear of Idolatry; and if not in paſſing by or neglecting God himſelf, and directing and fixing the mind and heart on the viſible Object, yet by help of that: For that contradicts the mind of God, as may appear by the whole Body of Gods worſhip, and every part thereof inſtituted by himſelf, without the leaſt inſinuation of ſuch manner of worſhip: Nay, it is very ſtrange what *Eraſmus* hath obſerved, That though indeed in praſtice it hath been connived at, yea commended, yet have not men dared as yet by any direct Precept to command the uſe of Images, at all, in Churches. *For that Images ſhould be in Churches* (ſaith *Eraſmus*) *no Conſtitution, ſo much as humane, requireth: And as it is more eaſie, ſo is it more ſafe to withdraw all Images out of Churches, then to prevail that the Mean ſhould not be exceeded, nor Superſtition mingled therewith.*

*Nam ut Imagines ſint in Templis, nulli præcipit vel humana Conſtitutio. Et ut facilius in tutius quoque eſt omnes Imagines è templis ſubmovere, quam impetrare, ut nec modus præteratur, nec admisceatur ſuperſtitio. Eraſm. in Symb. & Decalog. Catechef. 6.*

Thirdly, If that Rule of Explication holds good, viz. that in the Decalogue where a ſin is forbidden, there the occaſion leading thereunto is alſo forbidden, I make no doubt, but to worſhip the Creatour, or any Creature by an Image, is alſo here forbidden as Idolatrous, though perhaps not Idolatry abſolute. And contrary to the current ſenſe and diſtinction of modern Romaniſts concerning *Material* and *Formal* Idolatry (of which we have before ſpoken) denying an error about the Object to be Formal Idolatry, provided the intention be directed to the only true object of worſhip, God, we may more ſafely and properly call this outward viſible adoration given to outward objects, or at leaſt, ſeeming to be given to them, *Formal Idolatry*, than *Material*: becauſe there is nothing wanting to common ſenſe which might make and denominate it Idolatry, and this to have the Formalities of Idolatry: but if they take *Formal* for the inſinſick ſpecification of a thing, then it is a Contradiſtion and Nonſenſe to ſay, or ſuppoſe that there can be any Idolatry not *Formal*; as to imagine any thing can be without its form, or that which is abſolutely neceſſary to make it what it is.

Furthermore, this worſhipping of God by any thing made, is forbidden by this command, if not as ſimply and immediately unlawful in it ſelf, yet under the head of Scandal unjuſtly and unneceſſarily given: For in this Caſe

Cafe, it will no more, if so much as excuse a man from the just suspicion of Idolatry, that he upon occasion declares he does not worship the thing, before which he worships, than it could do them of whom St. Paul to the *Corinthians* speaks, who sat in the Idols Temple, being Christians, and knowing an Idol was as much as nothing in the world: and a man having so much Faith and Knowledge, might do as he please in neglect and contempt of that: but St. Paul could not be put off so, but knowing, and taking for granted that some did eat before an Idol with a conscience and sense of an Idol, as it were, adjured such presumers under the terrour of being accessary to the ruin of their brothers Souls, not to have to do with them. So what if it be true (as most true it is) a man may worship God or Saints before an Image, and have a right intention and pure conscience towards God, is it not also as true, that he may have an erroneous and idolatrous intention? Nay, are not the Evidences and Presumptions much more clear and strong that his intention is corrupt, then that it is pure? Can flesh and blood put any difference between the visible act of him that doth worship an Image directly and properly, and of him that doth not? Is not this then scandalous to sin? So that we may reasonably conclude this Command to stretch it self to forbid all worship by Images, and especially in publick, where there is more danger to others; though not under the same guilt or penalty as flat idolizing of any thing besides God: For in that it is said, *Thou shalt not bow down to them*, is plainly forbidden external reverence to, or before them in any way of Religious worship: In that it is said, *Nor worship them*, is expressed the internal act, and forbidden.

And thus far of the more literal sense of this Precept: the more remote and reductive sense (as I may call it) is to interdict all worshipping of Imaginations or vain opinions, which are certain Idols of the mind, as the other are of the outward senses. And thus Hieron upon the Prophet *Isay* tropically applies his words, *To whom will ye liken the Lord*, &c. *We may say that Arch-hereticks are here rebuked, who make sundry Idols out of their own heart*, &c. And again upon the same Prophet, afterward; *Quicquid de Idolis dictum est, potest referri ad hereſeon Principes*, &c. *Whatever the Prophet speaks of Idols, may be referred to the Ringleaders of Hereticks, who dexterously frame out of their own hearts certain images of their opinions, and of a lye, and worship them, knowing that they made them themselves: And think it not sufficient to keep them to themselves, unless they seduce other simpler folk with the adoration of them.* Against this little noted, but most frequently practised Idolatry, we have an excellent Sermon of a Reverend Prelate, long since made, and never more need was there then is now to inculcate this: when people blinded with the love of their own inventions and opinions of the sense of Scripture, run carelessly and rashly into the Idolatry of their own wayes, having first consecrated them with an obscure and mistaken Text of Scripture or two, and so made them (as they think) Divine: This is condemned in this Commandment; as are also all corrupting, depraving, mis-sensing Gods Holy Word; bringing in Sects and Heresies, disesteem and abuse of his Sacraments. And, to name no more, to be remiss, prophane, and negligent in the true Service and Worship of God, either by inward aversion or outward absenting themselves without just cause from him in his house, and denying him that outward adoration and humiliation, which he here forbids us to give any but himself: which he surely never would have done, had he not set some value on it himself.

1 Cor. 8. 4.

v. 7. 10, 11.

Hieron. in Isaiam c. 40.

Id. in Isaiam c. 44. v. 15, 16.

Bishop Andrews Sermon of worshipping Imaginations.  
*Sinulachris phantasmatum suorum scilicet error illudit.*  
 Aug. Expof. Ep ad Rom. Inchoatæ. lib.



And on the contrary, we are required positively here to give all outward as well as inward worship to him, as he is, in his illimited nature, without circumscribing him in our minds, or likening him to any corporeal being, how excellent soever.

The second Part of this Commandment gives us the reason of it, *viz. For I the Lord thy God am a jealous God*; deterring all men from the violation of the same, from the Power, Majesty, and Justice of him against such contemners of his worship and his word. So that as too often it is seen, that some fond, worldly, and covetous Parents, will even venture their own necks, and damn their souls out of an extream desire to advance their children, and to settle them sure and flourishing (as they think) in the world after them, God confounds this their plot and purpose, declaring that such a sin as this shall certainly be the ruin of the Family; For he will *visit the sin of the Fathers upon the third and fourth generation of them that so hate him*: That is, either He will after some intermission, and when it may be supposed that God will take no notice of the iniquity of them that thus offend him by Idolatry or Sacrilege (which the Apostle matches together as both offending against this Commandment) then will God arise and revenge himself upon the Posterity of such Malefactours: Or secondly, *to the third and fourth Generation*, that is, beginning to plague the unhappy Off-spring of such ungodly Progenitours, he will not give over till the third and fourth Generation; by which kind of persecution, it may well be believed an utter destruction may have consumed that race.

Rom. 2.22.

And to the common Querie here raised, How God can justly punish the Children for the Parents Iniquity? (not to trouble men with the many, diverse, and tedious subtleties wont to be shown in answer hereunto) This plain and simple Answer may suffice. First, that in matters of rapine, injustice, fraud, and the like, whereby men design to enrich themselves and Posterity, with great injury done to God or Man; for God out of his wise and just Providence to take away from the third and fourth Generation that which was wickedly acquired and possessed by the first Offender, is, in strictness of speech, no hard measure or punishment properly, but common justice and equity, yea a favour, in forbearing to exact that till so long time after, which he might the same day have most justly required back again from the first offender, in that kind, or his immediate succeder in that injustice. For ill-gotten, or unjustly detained goods can never in the eyes of God acquire a good title to him that possesses, or inherits them: And therefore the world indeed may well call the impoverishing of such offenders, a *blasting* and *curfing* of them and their Estate, but in truth, it is a kindness in God to deferr the execution of his justice for some times, that Repentance and Restitution might prevent his wrath. Neither can it be thought injustice that God doth not alwayes punish in the very same kind as the offense was committed in. For certainly, if with man it be just to punish the Body of Malefactours, as well as in their Estates, wherein perhaps the offense hath been committed, it is no less just with God, who is absolute Sovereign over us, to choose his way of afflicting an Offender.

But in some Cases there seems to be rather a personal punishment inflicted upon Heirs of wicked Parents, and this seems to be hard when it is suffered for their sakes rather than for any guilt of their own. To which, the Answer is: That every man hath so much guilt of sin upon him, that God might at his pleasure have inflicted what punishment, and when he pleases: yet those general sins incident to most men, would not have excited Gods displeasure

displeasure to that height, nor caused him to execute his just vengeance, but he considers that such of his Predecessors offended in such a kind, as he will early or late revenge; and takes occasion from thence to punish the innocent Posterity, as to those things, which otherwise, though out of severe justice he might have punished upon other respects, he would have respited and passed over. But then indeed is there more apparent reason on Gods side when (as *Thomas* resolves the doubt) the Children inherit the Evil minds and Consciences of their Parents, as well as the Effects of their Evil Consciences. And thus is this Commandment found consistent with that large vindication God by the Prophet *Ezekiel* makes of himself, wherein he shews that the Child shall not dye for the sin of his Father, which was the principal doubt. And it is much more easie by the Rule of Contraries to understand the reason, why God promises to be merciful to thousands in them that love him and keep his Commands. For God being absolute, and able to dispense with his own Laws, though a Righteous Father should have a wicked Son, God may for the Fathers sake spare the executing his just anger on the Posterity for the Fathers sake, taking occasion from thence, as many Instances of Scripture do plainly inform us.

Ezek. 18. 4, 20.

The third Precept of the Decalogue is, *Thou shalt not take the Name of the Lord thy God in vain: For the Lord thy God will not hold him guiltless that taketh his Name in vain.* Which consisteth also of two principal Parts: The Precept it self; and the Reason confirming and enforcing the same. *Thou shalt not take the Name of the Lord thy God in vain*, is the Precept: and in its strict and proper sense doth only forbid false swearing, or forswearing in the use of the Name of God. And Oaths are usually distinguished into two sorts, *Affertorie* and *Promissorie*. An *Affertorie* Oath is that whereby a man doth affirm or deny any thing, and that in the Name of God. If therefore a man shall make use of Gods Name to give credit and weight to his Assertion, which is false, as he frames it, he notoriously abuses the Name of God, and incurs the severe punishment annexed to, and denounced against the breach of this Commandment: He takes Gods Name in vain with a witness, as we say. Again, a *Promissorie* Oath being the Declaration of a mans mind and intention, whereby he obliges himself to perform some act to another acceptable to him, and that by the Name of God, used to assure the same: For a man to neglect or disregard, or willingly to violate this Promise so confirmed by Oath, is to take Gods Name in vain. To trifle and dally with that most sacred Name and Majesty: yea, to bring it down so low, as to serve base offices and acts of drudgery and wickedness, that no ingenuous or honest man with patience could endure. It is not only to belye and slander God, affirming that he knows such a thing to be true, which is known by him to be utterly false; but to make him, as far as may be, accessory and instrumental to such villanies as he wickedly purposes to commit. It is plainly to mock him, and to give and take away again presently. Nay lastly, seeing (as *St. Paul* saith) *An Oath is the end of all strifes*; and there is scarce found any other means, and to be sure none like it to determine Controversies between man and man, without which no justice can take place, and without which humane Society cannot subsist or continue: To be paltry, and frivolous, or mercenary, or careless, or impudent in swearing for fear or love of any thing but God, and his sacred Truth (for *God is Truth*) is the highest affront can ordinarily be put upon the

§. III.

Ἐστὶ πρᾶγμα  
ἡ μαρτυρία ἢ  
τὸ ἱσθὶ καὶ  
θενοῖ ἡ μαρ-  
τυρία καὶ ἐστὶ  
ὁ αὐτὸς περὶ  
πρᾶσμάτων  
ἀμφοτέρωθεν  
των. ὅρα ὅτι  
μάρτυρα ὁ  
ὁμιλεῖν ὅτι  
ἡ δὲ δὲ δὲ  
ἀνομιάν ἐστιν,  
ἔκ. Philo Ju-  
daeus de De-  
calog  
Hebr. 6. 16.

Divine

Divine Majesty : And therefore, when God says, he *will not hold such guiltless*, that thus take his name in vain, it is figuratively to be understood, God intending surely utter ruin and confusion to such Atheistical contemners and affronters of him to his face, and before the face of many others.

And reductively to this command doth pertain the sin of light, customary, and needless use of Gods name so sacred, upon no sufficient grounds or occasions. This is indeed to take Gods Name in vain, and this will he also not suffer to go unpunished : For this is in a manner to make sport with Gods Name, and to make him a laughing stock to use his Name, and that many times under the form of broad Oaths, to make the lye, or jest, or frippery take the better, and degrade and disgrace God Almighty, to grace their speeches, their tales, and witlefs, worthless, shameless language. For how stupid and miserable is the error of such who move admiration and laughter by most unseasonable and uncivil, as well as ungodly abusing of Gods Name, while they think they are admired for their gallantry and wit, when really they are ridiculous for the incongruity, monstrousness and absurdness of their speeches : For what is it else for a man to bring Gods magnificent and glorious Name down from Heaven to justify a meer toy or trifle, and that commonly a known lye, which he shall vent at pleasure ; but as if a man should bring a huge Cable to tie a fly by the legg ? This would indeed make men laugh, but at nothing so much as the folly of the Actour of it. And so in prophane and beastly matters, to utter the Name of God with great boldness, it is very likely that as some would tremble, others, to whom the wit is principally designed, would laugh loud enough ; & the absurd Coxcomb apt to think it is in applause of his wit, when really it is at his impudence and presumption ; as they would undoubtedly at him that should break wind backward in the Kings presence : And what is such kind of swearing, but breaking wind forward on Gods face ? There's indeed all the wit and mirth too. But no more of this.

Luke 12. 8.

The positive Vertues required by this Commandment, are often, and reverend, and affectionate using of Gods Name in Prayer, Praises, and Instructions of our selves and others : To confess God before men to the glory of God, though to the disadvantage and damage of our selves, when the Case requires, according to our Saviours words : *Whoever shall confess me before men, him shall the son of man also confess before the Angels of God.* And more particularly, is required by this Commandment, sober and conscientious swearing upon just occasion : For can any man of Religion or Reason imagine, that if (as some of late, and not till of late) suppose, God would not have men swear at all, he would pass that over in silence not only here, but through the whole Scripture, and give rules and orders how they should swear, as here he doth ? In that therefore God here saith, *Thou shalt not swear in vain* : he certainly implyeth a permission and right to swear by his Name rightfully ; and no other argument ought to be brought to prove the same, especially by us here aiming at brevity. But we have the Examples both of Old and New Testament proving this. To them of the New Testament, I know not well what they can, or have replied, St. Paul being frequent in it : as 2 Cor. 2. 23. Gal. 1. 20. 1 Thess. 2. 5. unless they say, That being divinely inspired, he had a particular dispensation ; which is as much as nothing ; it being not at all proved that this was from Dispensation, and not known Right. And to them of the Old Testament, they say, *It was a meer legal thing* : but this also is only said,



said, and not shewed as it ought to be: Nay the contrary may be shewed; because nothing was meerly legal or determining with the Law, which began not with the Law of *Moses*: but the Examples of *Abraham*, *Isaac*, and *Jacob*, who all swore, were much ancients than the Law of *Moses*: and therefore it was a *Natural* Law rather than *Mosaical*, whereby men swore anciently, and that was not disgraced, nor altered by the Law of the Gospel. But this miserable mistake is most frequent in the argumentations of presumptuous, but unskillful Treaters, and as they would be thought admirers of Scripture, that a just and righteous document shall fare the worse for being found by them in the Old Testament, though not at all relating to the *Mosaical* Law: and when they see cause, be rejected and disgraced, because it is there found.

But, say they, there are many places in the New Testament, as of our Saviour and St. *James*, strictly inhibiting swearing at all, *Matth.* 5. 24, 36. and chap. 23. 16, 18, 20. *James* 5. 12. These places being urged hard by Anabaptists, have driven men to a distinction never thought of till of late, and then chiefly, if not only by them of the Reformation, and especially beyond the Seas; whose Common-places generally distinguish between an Oath Publick, and exacted by the Magistrates, and an Oath Private, offered and uttered without any such Authority. That (say they) is lawful and not prohibited by the Scripture, but this they grant is. But upon tryal, as current as this notion is, there will be found nothing in Antiquity, nothing in Scripture, nothing in the nature of the thing it self, warranting it, or making it unlawful to swear that in private, with the due conditions of an Oath mentioned by *Jeremy*, viz. in Truth, in Judgment (not necessary publick but private) and in Righteousness, which a man may safely and innocently swear in publick. For who was over *Abraham*, *Isaac*, or *Jacob*, to require them to swear to others? Who can legitimate the Oaths of Princes one towards another? Who do except against the mutual stipulations of man and wife in contracts, because they are not alwayes performed before a Magistrate? Princes when they treat with one another, are but as private men: And yet all these swear solemnly and lawfully. And the reason of an Oath implied in the description given by St. *Paul*, doth justify this: For if an Oath be the end of all strifes, how shall those controversies be ended between private men without an Oath, when no Magistrate is at hand? If an Oath will effect peace and satisfaction without repairing to the Magistrate, what should hinder but it should have its natural effect and end, without molesting the Magistrate? Can the Magistrate make that part of the Worship of God (as lawful swearing is said to be) which in it self is not the Worship of God? But it may here be questioned farther, What? hath not the lawful Magistrate greater influence and power over an Oath than private men? To which I answer, that in this the lawful Powers have a special Prerogative above others, in reference to an Oath; that though it be just and lawful to swear without commission or command from the Magistrate, yet no man can exact an Oath but the Magistrate. It is free in private cases to give or refuse an Oath: but when lawful Authority pleases, it may extort an Oath from another, for the manifestation of truth, and to end differences; which no private man ought, or can do, any more without a mans consent, than he can take away his purse.

Lastly, This Right in private Persons to determine differences by private Oaths, appears from the tacite consent of such as openly deny it. For they generally practise it themselves, and it is altogether unavoidable by them

Jer. 4. 2.

them that have any commerce or controversies in the world: it being natural unto all men to appeal to God, when they have truth and justice on their sides, not so appearing to others. What is more necessary for the gaining of belief, and giving satisfaction to doubters, than to say, *God is my witness: I call God to witness: God he knows*, and such like, all which are forms of swearing, though not after the manner of Judicial proceedings. And who doth not fall into these, unless we chance to except a fullen and superstitious Sect, whose Religion is of their own making? *For an Oath is the bringing God in as a witness*, saith St. Augustine in his first Sermon of Christs Sermon on the Mount. And in another place he advises thus: *Avoid swearing as much as you can: For it is better not to swear when a thing is true. For by customary swearing men often fall into a precipice, and come near to Perjury: But they (so far as I have heard some of them) do not know what it is to swear. For they think they do not swear, when they have in their mouths, God he knows, and, God is my witness, &c. I call God to witness upon my Soul, because they say not, BY GOD: These are Austins words in his Eighty ninth Epistle, where he writes against the Pelagians, who held an opinion (it should seem by St. Austin there) that men should not swear at all; and yet used such manner of speeches as these. By God, is no more than to say, God punish me if it be not so*, saith Thomas.

*Jurat qui adhibet Testem Deum, Aug. l. i. de Serm. Dom. in Mon. Juramentum cave quantum potes.*

*Nihil est autem aliud dicere, Per Deum ita est, nisi quod Deus puniat: me si non ita est. Thomas in Decem Precepta. Opuscul. pag. 100.*

Now in answer to the places of Scripture, and also some of the Ancients declaring against Swearing, we may interpret them to imply in their general words, only a restraint in two things: The matter, and the manner. The matter is expressly forbidden by Christ, when he instanceth in the Heavens, the Earth, the Temple, the Gold of the Temp'le, the Altar, or a mans Head: all which, as any other thing inferiour to God Almighty, are forbidden expressly by Christ, as derogatory to God: part of whose Prerogative it is, to be the Decider and judge of Controversies in such cases; and of whose worship, to be invoked in that manner. The manner is to do this lightly upon a mans own head, and for his pleasure, rather than for any use or necessity of an Oath.

§. IV.

The Fourth Commandment is, *Remember thou keepst holy the Seventh day, Six dayes, &c.* of which we have spoken what may suffice our ends, where we discoursed of the Circumstance of Time of Gods worship. And to determine the doubts of late about the morality or ceremonialness of this Precept, would require a distinct Volume. It may only here be noted that Nothing in this Precept doth directly and immediately bind Christians, but only Reductively, according to the opinions of such who hold that All Evangelical Acts are reducible to the Decalogue, as well as Natural and Moral Acts. But if the whole Law of Moses sufficed not to advise us directly and plainly of our duty towards God and our Neighbour, can we think that so small a Segment, so few Lines as the Decalogue, are sufficient? If the Law had been sufficient, according to St. Paul, The Gospel had been in vain. Yet do we acknowledge a natural equity and justice contained in the Fourth Commandment, which may give grounds to found other Doctrines of the Gospel than are there expressed. And some of the Jewish Doctors, whom Grotius citeth, and much approveth, do distinguish this Commandment from it self: For they say, That part of it is Moral (not as is not amiss held by many, that it hath thorow out a Moral and a Mosaical or Ceremonial sense) and part Judaical; as they would demonstrate by the reason of it given expressly and implicitly: For they say, That these words, *Remember that thou keep holy the Seventh day*, do bind from the reason of the

Gal. 2. 21. & 3. 21.

Grotius in Decalogum.

the Creation, and Gods making the World : but that the Jews were enjoyned to rest from all labour on that day, was from the consideration of their particular deliverance from the servitude of *Egypt* : So that they were obliged to remember to sanctifie the Seventh day, in commemoration of the Creation of the World ; but so to sanctifie it, as to rest from all Labours, in commemoration of their hard labours in *Egypt*, from which they were delivered. Of which interpretation we may say thus much ; That it very well agrees with the reason given in *Deuteronomy* of the Sabbath, which is omitted in *Exodus*. For there the Command is enforced thus, immediately after the Precept of Rest, *And remember that thou wast a servant in the land of Egypt, and that the Lord thy God brought thee out thence, through a mighty hand, and stretched-out arm, therefore the Lord thy God commanded thee to keep the Sabbath day.* Deut. 5. 14, 15

In the fifth place it is said, *Honour thy Father and thy Mother, that thy dayes may be long, &c.* which words have two Parts ; The Precept and the Motive or Reason of the Precept. In the Precept is to be observed the Ground of it, and the Form of it. And what is the Ground and Original of Childrens Duty and Obedience to their Parents, and of Servants to their Masters, and of Subjects to their Sovereign, but a preventing benefit which they receive from them. And surely one, if not the onely (next to his own glory) end of Gods requiring here obedience of Inferiour to Superior, is the natural and moral benefits derived by them to their Inferiours ; and that by Gods will and appointment too. So though it is scarce to be supposed that Parents or Governours should so unnaturally fail of their duty and design God had in setting them over others, as to acquit these from rendring honour to them ; yet the better to facilitate, and to oblige more strongly Inferiours to do their duties, God doth in this Command also require that Parents of all sorts should conscionably discharge their part to their Children. For there being two general motives to all duties, Love and Ingenuity, and fear of evil and necessity, it is not so prudent nor so powerful to hang all upon one, as on both. 'Tis true, God hath put power into the hands of Parents and Princes and Governours to constrain and exact the duty of Obedience from their respective Subjects : but he hath put a natural principle of Love into their hearts also, inclining them to goodness towards them ; which notwithstanding is neither so general nor effectual, but many fail egregiously in it : wherefore God, by his holy Word, advertiseth and exhorteth to the exercise of it ; and as it were, the better to dispose and bow those in subjection to them, to perform their duty with cheerfulness. And therefore *St. Paul*, after the duty of Obedience imposed upon Children, layeth a duty upon Parents on their Children, saying : *And ye Fathers provoke not your Children ; but bring them up in the admonition of the Lord :* That is, Exercise not imperiously and impertinently that power God hath given you over your Children, rather be known ye can do it ; and so, when it is discerned, that it is rather the Lust of a tyrannous nature, than of natural care, love, or kindness which urges them to rule with vain rigour, the Children be provoked to break their bonds, and pass the bounds which otherwise might have been observed to the glory of God, and comfort of both : Yet doth not the Apostle justifie such excess in children, more than the extream of Parents ; but only foretels the evil event of such unchristian rigour. Ephes. 6. 4.

And the like may be said of Servants and Masters mentioned next by the Apostle : who having prescribed an Evangelical principle of demeanor Ephes. 6.



of Servants towards their Masters, doth subjoyn the like Precept to Masters. *And ye Masters do the same things unto them, forbearing threatening, knowing that your Master also is in Heaven: neither is there respect of persons with him:* Intimating the ground of hearty, ingenuous, and faithful service of Children and Servants, to proceed commonly from the Fountain of love and kindness in the Parents and Masters: and therefore, if they would be well served, they should first serve God themselves, in educating them according to Gods gentle Law, and be careful to instruct them in the fear of God. And so where the Apostle stateth the mutual obligation between Man and Wife, he tempereth his counsel with reciprocal kindneses, that as the Wife is to submit her self to her own Husband, the Husband is to love his Wife, and that by vertue of this Commandment, which can never be well kept, according to Gods mind, where there is a faileur on either hand; though St. Peter tells us, like a true Evangelical Preacher, that with good Christians and true Believers, it is no exemption from duty and proper subjection, that our Superiours transgress the laws of modesty, sobriety and moderation towards us. But Servants, and by the same rule, Subjects and Children ought to be subject with all fear, *not only to the good and gentle, but also to the froward;* and that for reasons immediately following: And the same requireth St. Paul to Titus.

Eph. 5. 21, 25.

1 Pet. 2. 18, 19,

20.

Titus. 2. 9.

But here it is queried by some, Why St. Paul having taken occasion to adjust the duties between Masters and Servants, Parents and Children, Husbands and Wives, omitteth wholly to restrain and regulate the power of Princes towards their Subjects, leaves no Rules for them, as if they might offend, or offending might not be informed of their duty by Christian Doctrine?

To this we say, First, what some have well observed and affirmed before us, The reason hereof is, because in St. Pauls dayes there were no Sovereign Powers of the Christian Religion; and therefore it might have seemed unseasonable and vain, to offer counsel and rules to them who were not capable of them: For had there been such Princes, no doubt is to be made but he would have seasoned them, and sanctified them with his wholesome documents.

And yet Secondly, He doth not absolutely dismiss them without advice, who may be well reduced to the Head of Parents of Countries, and Masters of their Subjects.

And thus much for the principle of honouring our Superiours, from the benefit of their duties towards us. Now the Principles of Obedience more immediately obliging us unto them, are in brief, The Fear and Honour of God, whose Image, Representatives, and Instruments they are for our Good. No man after so many Reasons and Precepts given us in holy Scripture of faithful and conscionable submission to our Superiours, can be said to fear God, who doth not honour his Superiours: For of all Civil Parents or Governours, St. Paul saith, *They are the Ministers of God to thee for good:* And of our Natural Parents well admonisheth the Wise-man, *Honour thy Father with thy whole heart, and forget not the sorrows of thy Mother. Remember that thou wast begot of them, and how canst thou recompence them the things they have done for thee?* And of our Ecclesiastical Parents, to the Hebrews.

Luke 10. 16.

Rom. 13. 4.

Eccles. 7. 27,

28.

Hebr. 13. 17.

1 Theff. 5. 12,

13.

Now the Act, Honour, doth imply all inward affection and proper humility of mind; and all outward demonstrations of the same, by sober, modest, humble respect and reverence unto them: As also service, assistance, obedience,

dience, attendance, relief in straits, feeding, clothing, and comforting them in their wants, weaknesses, and distresses, and finally contributing all we are able to their well being, who, next under God, were the Causes of our Beings in the world. But of the manner or extent of our Obedience, especially to our Civil Parents, and of the contrary evil, Resistance, we have spoken before.

The last motive to this duty is expressed in the Reason annexed to this Commandment, *viz. That thy dayes may be long in the Land which the Lord thy God shall give thee*: intimating a signal blessing of God upon them that so reverence his Deputies, whether Natural, Civil, or Ghostly, and a malediction unto such as deny the same upon false, wicked, fleshly, or vain pretences: But of the vertue and duty of Obedience we have spoken before.

Ephes. 6. 2.

See Part 1.  
Book 1. ch. 26

§. VI.

The Sixth Commandment followeth, *Thou shalt do no murder*, as it is well rendred in our English Translation. For *Murder* is that which imports the killing of Man only, and so doth the Hebrew word here used רצח, in opposition as it were to הרג common to all killing, whether of Man or Beast. Which though it might not be an argument to the Superstitious Heathens, of the Pythagorean, or rather Indian strain, the Gymnosophists, (from whom *Pythagoras* borrowed his opinion) denying it lawful to take away the life of any thing, in so much as *Aristotle* tells us, that *Empedocles* the ancient Greek Philosopher wrote a Book with this Title, *Of not killing any living thing*: And *Pliny* writes of the *Amyle*, whose chief City was *Auxur* in *Italy*, that being Pythagoreans, they suffered themselves to be consumed by Serpents, because they would not kill them. Yet methinks, the Manichæan Hereticks should not have fallen into so great superstition, having the use of the Scripture: where God giveth Man free liberty to convert the Beasts of the field to his food, as well as the Hearb of the field. But perhaps the Latin word *occides* being general, may have deceived them, as St. *Augustine* intimateth; where he tells us that the Manichees grounded their opinion *Of not killing any living thing*, upon this Commandment, *Thou shalt not kill*: which St. *Augustine* there refuteth from their own opinion and practise. For they held also an opinion that Plants had life too: and yet they destroyed them, in eating Hearbs. And there wanted not some conscientious and learned Christians, who held it against Christian perfection and purity to kill any man, though in just defense; as did *Ambrose*, who doth not absolutely deny it to be lawful, yet looks upon it as a blemish to Christian Religion to shed blood. So that he holds it scarce lawful in such a case as shipwrack, for one man to save his own life, by thrusting another man of a planck, which might have carried him to land; and so, to return blows back to him again, that, as a Robber on the High-way, shall assail him; *least in defending his life, he corrupts or stains his Religion*. To this we can only say, That the Church hath been so tender and pure in her Profession, that though she hath not any where condemned that we call natural and lawful Resistance, to the securing of a mans Fortunes, and especially Life; yet hath she in her Canons of Irregularities, set such a value and reverence upon the blood of man, that even involuntary, and much more voluntary killing any man, doth by her Decrees render one in Priestly Orders incapable of doing his Office: because, as St. *Ambrose* his words imply, though the guilt before God should not be great, yet the blemish and scandal before men would be so; and all suspicion and appearance of evil ought to be avoided.

Aristotel.  
Rhetor. 1.  
Περὶ τῆς μὴ  
κτείνειν τὸ ζῶον  
Ἰουλιαν.  
Plin. Hist. Nat.  
l. 2. c. 5.

Exod. 9. 3.

Aug. Civ. Dei.  
l. 1. c. 20.Ne dum salu-  
tem defendat,  
Pietatem con-  
taminet.  
Ambr. 31 Off.  
cap.

And this way of arguing, which is yet the only of any colour, is of much less force to make wars unlawful, being denounced by just Authority, as late Fanaticks would pretend at least to hold, to gain esteem of men of singular consciences, which yet gross experience hath certified us, extends no farther than opportunity and advantage have enabled and encouraged them to violate. For a man hath not power absolute over his own person, but is under the command of his Superiours, who are to judge of the reasonableness of the endangering his own life, and destroying the life of another. For if we should so far affront the Law of Nature, as to grant a man might not use any Self-defence to the apparent loss of the life of another, it would not from thence follow at all that he might not receive power and authority, and such a command (which to deny were sinful) to bereave another of his life. How many examples in the Old Testament justify this? In the New Testament, having no instance of such Christians as had any Sovereign Political Power, do we wonder that we have neither Example nor Precept directly commending this to Christian practise? But by implication we have; when St. Paul exhorteth thus, *Let every man abide in the same calling wherein he is called.* Now it was well known to the Apostle, that there were continual wars in the Roman Empire, and that many Christians were Souldiers, and that that was their *Calling* wherein they were called: For *Cornelius* was a Souldier. And when the Souldiers came to St. *John Baptist* enquiring, *What shall we do?* He did not say, *Lay down your Commission: Serve no longer:* But, *Do violence to no man, neither accuse any falsely; and be content with your wages:* which is as much as, Use your employment soberly and justly, neither prey upon any man, upon your private account.

1 Cor. 7.20.

Luke 3. 14.

Matth. 5. 22,  
38. 39. 40. 41.See Paulus Fa-  
gins on Lev.  
19. 16.

And whereas the words of Christ in his Sermon on the Mount, seem to be pretended to the contrary, Christ there exhorting patiently to bear affronts and injuries, without revenging a mans self; they are to be understood of violence repayed without lawful Authority, either expressed or implied: but this is alwayes implied in just defences. And again, these are rather Counsels, than Commands, peremptorily forbidding so to do, but advising to forbear that out of a Spirit of meekness and patience, which is not utterly unlawful to do, but to the disadvantage of the Gospel in general, and the diminution of that reward annexed to the humble and patient suffering of wrongs for Gods sake: But though this is to be preferred before the other, it follows not, that the other is unlawful: or that it is so much as lawful to forbear executing justice on such offenders, when commanded by good Authority. And so do the Jews interpret those words of *Leviticus* — *Thou shalt not stand against the blood of thy neighbour*, thus, as *Fagins* hath noted on the place: *Whoever is able to deliver his neighbour in any of his Members, and doth it not, he is in the same guilt as if he shedded blood, and becomes guilty of death.* And it is impossible a man should be guilty of blood in doing that, which he shall be, in that he doth it not.

It being thus explained, what is *not* meant by this Command, what *is* by it intended, may more briefly be declared: and that, as in other Precepts, is of two sorts, Negative, Not to murder: against which foul and crying sin, so much and so plainly is denounced in holy Writ, that to recount them here in this short Comment, were unseasonable and superfluous. It may be defined, *A wilful and unjust taking away the life of a Man.* And there are



are two principle Causes of this unjustness. First, No good or warrantable ground or demerits: Secondly, No good Authority to do. Now Authority is twofold, Express, and Implicite. There is no express Law commanding the destruction of another that seeks mine, but Implicite there is; and so it may be just. Express is that which exerciseth it self against convicted Malefactours. And of both these is he destitute who executeth himself. I cannot say that it is unlawful for a man required by just Authority, to kill himself: but of himself to do this, is certainly a murderous act, though he were guilty of Death. For as St. *Austin* hath observed, *He that killeth himself, doth certainly kill a man: and it is not said, Thou shalt not kill thy neighbour or another man, but simply, Thou shalt not kill.* And though indeed about the earliest dayes of the Persecution of the Church of Christ, some men, and more especially young women, to prevent the abuses of their bodies, cast themselves away, and this was connived at by the Church; yet, upon more mature discussion and consideration of the notoriousness of the Fact, it was condemned expressly by the Church: nay, for men needlessly and voluntarily to declare and publish themselves to be Christians, and so to offer themselves to the Sword of the Magistrate, was judged wicked, and the practisers of it denyed to be Christians, any farther than in name: as appears in *Clemens Alexandrinus*. And those Noble Persons, who are recorded in Scripture to have affected such deaths, can be no more presidents for to justify this sin, than others, other scandalous sins; unless, as St. *Austin* inclineth to believe, answering the furious Donatists (who out of mad zeal rather against the Church than for God, were wont to destroy themselves) they had some special instinct so to do from God, as *Sampson* might be thought to have, in that he was divinely assisted above his ordinary strength, to pull down the house: And besides, his intention was not out of weariness or discontent of his life principally to destroy himself, but the Enemies of God, of himself, and the people of God. And there seems no great difficulty or inconveniencie to grant that a man may run himself into apparent danger of his life, to bring a most notorious damage to the Enemies of God and his Country, though not upon his own head, but by just Authority. So that I make no doubt but *Voetius* determined the Case of Conscience amiss, denying that a man in desperation of saving himself and his ship of War, from falling into the hands of his Enemies, may with a good Conscience blow it up, and all in it. For all his arguments prove no more than that this a man may not do of himself; because no man must slay himself: but they prove not that a man may not do this by command and injunction of his Superiours, in whose power his life is, and to whom belongs his Vessel.

And what is said against a mans destroying his own life, or his neighbours, makes also against any maiming or mutilation of the body of himself or others, though not ending in death. The true reason of all which is; First, because it is against a Law of Nature imprinted deeply by God himself in the minds of men, yea all living creatures to study and endeavour their own preservation, which Law is hereby directly broken. Secondly, No man is absolute Master of himself: but first (as *Plato* hath noted) is, as it were, the Goods of God, and then a Servant to his Country, and therefore without Gods consent, or his Countries, by the Sovereign power, discharges him of his duty and service towards it, he is an Offender against both. And hereunto pertains the high Crime of causing Abortion and Miscarriages of Women to hide their former sin,

Aug. Civ. Dei  
l. 1. c. 17.

Clem. Alex.  
l. 4. Strom.  
p. 481. & 54.

Aug. l. c. 26.  
Civ. Dei.

Voetius Se-  
lect. Disp.  
Part 4. p. 256.

Recte dicitur  
inquit Socra-  
tes, ὁ δὲ θεὸς  
ἡμῶν ὁρμε-  
νομένων, καὶ ἡ-  
μᾶς τοὺς ἀν-  
θρώπους ἐν τῇ  
κλήματι τοῖς  
θεοῖς εἶναι,  
&c. *Plato* in  
*Phaedone*.

And

And as the Fact it self is forbidden, so all ordinary Causes tending thereunto; as all evil and provoking language: All evil affections, as hatred, anger, malice, and such like: All assistance by conspiring, counselling, or acting outwardly, are certainly forbidden.

Lastly, as the thing it self and all evil acts and offices are forbidden, so because the Righteousness of Christians must exceed that of Scribes and Pharisees, as our Saviour Christ saith in St. *Matthew*, therefore Christians are obliged hereby to all reasonable and charitable acts of love, friendship, piety, as well as justice, conducing to the support and preservation and comfort of their brethren, especially in Christ; as St. *Paul* advises to the *Galatians*: *As we have therefore opportunity, let us do good unto all men, especially unto them who are of the household of Faith*: And herein he followed the Precept of Christ, *I say unto you, Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them which despitefully use you, and persecute you: That ye may be the Children of your Father which is in heaven: for he maketh, &c.* And therefore by this Commandment are required of us all acts of Mercy; as Visiting the sick and imprisoned, Feeding the hungry, Clothing the naked, Ministering assistance by counsel and action to the oppressed, Comfort to the dejected, and such like: Knowing and considering that they, who as Goats, stand at the Left hand of Christ at the last Day of Judgment, shall not be condemned only for injuries and injustices done to others, but because Christ in his members *was an hungred, and ye gave him no meat, was thirsty, and ye gave him no drink: Was a stranger, and ye took him not in: naked, and ye clothed him not: sick and in prison, and ye visited him not.*

§. VII. The Seventh Commandment interdicteth all uncleanness in these words, *Thou shalt not commit Adultery*: Which *Philo Judæus* following herein the *Septuagint*, and having no skill in the Hebrew or Original Tongue (as hath been observed by learned men, and is easily to be discerned by any Reader) placeth before the Commandment, *Thou shalt not kill*: though in the Fifth Chapter of *Deuteronomy*, where the Decalogue is repeated, the order of the Original is observed; which implyeth some Errour happening in *Exodus*: For neither is the reason of *Philo* or *Grotius* inclining to that opinion, valid; viz. because Adultery is the greatest sin a man can commit against his neighbour: For undoubtedly Murder is more heinous. There is some variety in the New Testament in the reciting of this Command: For *Mark* 10. 9. and *Luke* the 18. 20. the order of the *Septuagint* in *Exodus* is kept; *Matthew* 19. 18. the order of *Deuteronomy* is followed; which teaches that the diversity was ancient, and that not stood scrupulously on. But the putting of, *Thou shalt not steal*, before *Thou shalt not commit adultery* in *Exodus* 20. not approved by *Philo*, or his Followers, should make that place of *Exodus* more suspected of alteration than that of *Deuteronomie*.

But the matter not being great, and that only concerning the Greek Translation, the End and Contents of this Law are more seriously to be attended; which may be conveniently reduced to these following heads. First unclean thoughts, and inward motions and dispositions, and most of all Resolutions to offend in act, being not hindered: For this Christ our most pure President and holy Doctour condemns for adultery in the Heart,

Heart, *Matth. 5. I say unto you, that whosoever looketh on a woman to lust after her, hath committed adultery with her in his heart.* Not he that looketh on a woman, but he that looketh on her to lust after her, is condemned, though all curious, studious, idle impertinent views of men or women, upon which may follow ordinarily the sparks, and then the flames of lust, are forbidden. Again, not all lusting of the heart is to be compared to the acts of lusting inwardly with the act outward joyned to that. Adultery of the heart our Saviour Christ doth not equal to the Adultery of act; but makes it Adultery in a degree inferiour.

Secondly, There is uncleanness of the Tongue too, when it breaketh out into impure, light, foolish, lascivious speeches, tending to begetting evil thoughts and acts in others; against which St. Paul declareth in his Epistle to the Ephesians: *Let no corrupt communication come out of your mouth: but that which is good to the use of edifying, that it may minister grace to the hearers:* And to the Colossians; *But now ye also put off all these, anger, wrath, malice, blasphemy, filthy communication, out of your mouth.*

Thirdly, Actual uncleanness which is accomplished in the deeds of the flesh: And hath several degrees; which may be distinguished into *Unnatural* and *Natural*. *Unnatural* consisteth in the vile acts a man or woman may commit upon their own bodies, perverting the course and end of nature, instituting diversity of Sexes for sower and profitable propagation, making that void, in some manner at least. At which St. Paul may seem to strike, as far as modesty would permit, when he says, *It is a shame to speak of those things which are done of them in secret:* meaning the impurities of Gnostick and Valentinian Conventicles, to the reproach of Primitive Christianity: *Epiphanius* relating how, besides those called natural lusts between Sexes distinct, they dishonoured and corrupted their own bodies, in the highest acts of single uncleanness, and made up some of their Mysteries thereby. And however single persons do not so prodigiously abuse themselves as did those impure Hereticks, pretending greater Sanctity and deeper Mysteries in their Religion than the Catholicks, yet must it needs be a great offense to God, so to corrupt a mans self in yielding to fleshly temptations, condemned by Heathen Poets, though themselves were immodest, for a violation of the Law of Nature it self: which therefore all Christians, especially of weak reason, strong passions, and young years, are most watchfully to beware of, and resolutely to avoid.

Another sort of acted, rather than actual, Uncleanness here prohibited, is the foul sin of Sodomie, to which the wicked Citizens of *Sodom*, destroyed by fire, gave denomination, as may appear in the Book of *Genesis*: And of which St. Paul to the *Romans* speaketh, when he saith that God delivered up the Gentiles to these unnatural Lusts, as a punishment of their gross Idolatry: *For this cause God gave them up to vile affections: For even their women did change the natural use into that which is against nature. And likewise the men leaving the natural use of the women, burned in their lusts one towards another, men with men working that which is unseemly, and receiving in themselves that recompense of their errors which was meet.*

A Third unnatural Lust is that called Bestiality, or abusing, or being abused by Beasts, in lustful acts, against which God hath in his Word, as well as by the Light and Law of Nature, declared.

The more natural, but yet unchristian Lusts here forbidden are Adultery, which is either simple, viz. when a married person committeth uncleanness with an unmarried: where some make two kinds, the one when the man is married

Matth. 5. 28.

Coloss. 4. 29.

Coloss. 3. 8.

Ephes. 5. 12.

Οἱ παμμεγίστοι  
καὶ δυσάνθυτοι,  
καὶ μυστικῶς  
κοιτανύσαντες ὁ-  
νόμασαν τὴν  
ἀσχημάν.  
Theodoret.  
Hæret. Fa-  
bul. cap. 7.

Gen. 19. 4. 5.

Rom. 1. 26.

Lev. 28. 23.



1 Cor. 7. 4.

married, but the woman single, which they commonly make the less, and so indeed it is, by reason that it brings no spurious brood to inherit or share the Goods of any other man, but him that he knowingly and willingly bestows them on. The other is, when the woman is married, and the man single, which is, besides the general sin, subject to the foresaid mischief: And therefore hereby the woman offends in these four respects: *Incredulity*, not believing or regarding the Law and Word of God to the contrary. 2. *Not reverencing* the Laws of the Church. 3. *Treachery* against her Faith and Troth given before God to her Husband, whereby she delivered unto him the power of her Body, as St. Paul speaketh 1 Cor. 7. as likewise doth the Husband to his Wife, upon the same occasion: and therefore thus far the Man and Woman transgressing, offend equally. 4. They say, the Woman in such cases is a *Thief*, in that she spoileth her Husband of his goods, and giveth them to a false Issue he would knowingly no wayes yield them to.

Thomas in decem  
Præceptis, Opusc. 3.

But yet saith *Thomas*, the man sinneth no less than the woman, however he may flatter himself otherwise: And the sum of his reason is this; First, Because that the man hath no more power over his Body than the woman over hers. Secondly, Because the man is stronger naturally than the woman, and endued with more reason. Thirdly, Because the man is the Head of the woman, and her teacher, as St. Paul saith; therefore, as it is a greater sin for a Priest than a Layman to offend in that kind, so is it for a man, who is as it were Gods Minister, even in spiritual matters to the woman. And in truth we find little or no difference put by the Scripture between the fact of the one and the other; St. James joyning them thus together, *Ye Adulterers and Adulteresses, know ye not that the friendship of the world is enmity with God?* Yet Moses his Law decreed the Adulterers to be put to death, but not the Adulterer, as offending more against the Civil capacity of Man: And perhaps for the hardness of their hearts, lest they should do it themselves, God would have it done in a more orderly and just way: Some Laws of Christians at this day granting the man leave to kill his wife himself, finding her in actual Adultery.

James 4. 4.

Levit. 20. 10.

1 Cor. 6, 9, 10.

Fornication likewise which some calling *Simple*, have legitimated in great measure, is condemned by this Commandment: St. Paul, as it were foreseeing, and intending to confound such modern Doctors, saith, *Know ye not that the unrighteous shall not inherit the Kingdom of God? be not deceived, neither Fornicators, nor Idolaters, nor Adulterers, nor Effeminate, nor Abusers of themselves with mankind; Nor Thieves, nor Covetous, nor Drunkards, nor Revilers, nor Extortioners, shall inherit the Kingdom of God.* And to the Hebrews—— But Fornicators and Adulterers God shall judge. And so likewise the Excusers or Extenuaters of them, so far as to bring down the guilt of either of them to that of a venial sin only, which is as much as nothing: But *Thomas* speaks soundly and plainly, *It is therefore an Heresie to say simple Fornication is no mortal sin.*

Est ergo hæresis dicere, Fornicationem simplicem non esse peccatum mortale. Thom. ib.

And if simple Fornication be, as certainly it is, a mortal sin, then surely it is much more grievous, when it hath the aggravations of *Consupration*, or *Deflowering* of a Virgin; her Virginity being her natural grace and glory. And much more *Ravishing*, or invading violently the chastity of others. And so *Incest* committed against the Laws of Nature, of God, or the Religion we profess, concerning consanguinity and affinity. And there is another Degree of Lust, which is called *Sacrilege*, extending the word a little of the farthest, to express the great wickedness of abusing those who have dedicated

icated themselves in a state of Virginitie, to Gods Service. For as we have shown before, as it is not only lawful, but very commendable in any good Christian, upon sober and mature consideration of the probability of being able to make good such holy resolutions, to devote himself, or her self, to such excellent means of serving God, and that by a Vow, so can it not be but a notorious offence against God, to mock him either with committing fornication, or entering into marriage, otherways lawful. If indeed Marriage were such a Law, as some grossly conceive of it, that not to comply with it, were to offend God, then were it not lawful to design any such life as Virginitie, nor yet widowhood, being in ordinary capacity; and then were most of their arguments good, urged against the state of Virginitie chosen by way of Vow: But it being a *Jus* or *Right* rather, that every man hath of God, then a *Lex* or *Law*, that he should marry, their reasons prove very fallacious and vain: And they who shall go about to seduce to marriage (and much more, other more scandalous and vitious acts) them that have so decreed in their heart to live to God, do very wickedly, notwithstanding so great a President as *Luther* may be alledged to the contrary, and the judgment of *Perkins* and others.

Lastly, To these may be reduced all outward acts and signs of Lightness and Lasciviousness, tending to Wantonness and Lust: Evil Dalliances and Speeches, and Gestures, and Attire, and Ornaments to insinuate evil to others, or to tempt them: as likewise Intemperance fomenting the Law of the Members, as *St. Paul* speaks, against the Law of the mind.

The Eighth Commandment is, *Thou shalt not steal.* In the Second Table Gods principal intention it was to preserve one man from offering violence or injury to another. Injury is done to man two wayes in General: *To his Person*; or *To his Goods and Possessions.* The Injury done to a mans *Person*, is either committed against him *simply*; and this is forbidden under the Commandment, *Thou shalt do no murder*: or against him *joynly*, as he is one with another. For so God saith, *They two shall be one flesh*, man and wife making in several senses but one Person: and therefore to offend against the Person of one, is to wrong both: And therefore it is said, *Thou shalt not commit Adultery.* For hereby notorious injustice is done to the person so united to the Party suffering evil. Neither can it be alledged, what too often happens, that there is consent on one part, and so no injury: because first, Neither God, nor the other Party, to both which the will of the Offender is to be no less subject than to himself, doth consent.

A Second Injury is done to the Goods of a man by sustaining loss or detriment: and against this evil doth God here provide by saying, *Thou shalt not steal.* Concerning which we are to consider briefly *The Ground, The Extent* or *Kinds*, and lastly, *The Evil* of Thefts.

The Original and Cause of this Commandment is certainly Justice, and Equity to be observed between man and man, in all Common-wealths: and without which no humane, and much less, Divine or Religious Society can long continue. Justice is or may be taken two wayes, *Abstractly*, as it may be considered in it self, as a Divine Rule and Law propounded by God according to which he requireth all men to conform their Actions. And therefore *Plutarch* speaketh divinely; *God not only hath Justice sitting by him; but is himself Justice and Right, and the ancientest and perfectest of all Laws.* In which yet he seems to be prevented by more Divine *David*, saying of God, *Psal. 9. 4. Thou satest (or fittest) in the throne judging right.*

X x x

God

§. VIII.

Ὁ μὲν Ζεὺς  
ἐνικλῶν τὴν  
δικὴν παρὰ  
δρόν, ἀλλ' αὐ-  
τὸς δικάζει καὶ  
δίκης ἐστὶ καὶ  
νόμον ὁ πρῶτος  
ἐταίρος καὶ  
τελειότερος.  
Plut.  
Περὶ Ἡρακλέους  
καὶ Ἀλκ.

Gerson de  
Vita Spiritu-  
ali, Lect. 3.

Aug. Civ. Dei  
c. 4.

Lactan. 1. 5.  
cap. 14.

Matth. 7. 12.

Esay 1. 23.

Prov. 28. 4.

God is Justice, and so is his Will revealed as a Rule of humane affairs. And Justice is in man too, concretely, as they speak, and so is defined, *A perpetual and constant will of giving every man his due*: though Gerson would have this to relate principally to God: And that of Fact it doth, is most true: it being impossible God should do or desire to do injury to any man: but as of Form and Right it concerneth man no less, because he is perpetually and immutably obliged to do justly, though actually he doth it not: *For without this what are Kingdoms [ or Common-wealths ] (saith Austin) but Slaughter-houses?* And much more may we say, What is Religion without Justice, but extreamest Villany? there being nothing so ridiculous to all men, or blasphemous to Christ, as to imagine a man can be a good Christian, before he is an honest and just man.

This Justice hath two parts, as Lactantius writeth, *Piety* to God, and *Equity* to man. For Justice (as we have showed in the beginning of this Work) it is, to be Religious towards God, and to worship him; and greatest Injustice to deny him such his due. Equity towards Man, is that we even now described: and which is in this Law commanded. But because Justice or Equity are said to be Vertues, whereby a Man gives every one his due or own, they must be grounded upon Dominion: and *Dominion is nothing else but a Propriety a man hath to use a thing which he possesseth as he pleaseth*. The principal act of Injustice then, is to violate this Propriety, or withdraw, or withhold any thing from another, which of right belongs to him: not observing our Saviours rule in his Sermon on the Mount, *Whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do you also unto them: for this is the Law and the Prophets*. The Law and the Prophets both contained, and here signifie the whole substance of Religion of the Church under the Law, and therefore such moral honesty and justice as this, being the chief subject of these Books, is likewise the substance of Religion it self, improved by Christ to some higher perfections.

Now the Extent of this sin of stealing or injustice, is First, to open violence in Robbery, and spoiling of others of that which they are rightly possessed of without colour of Justice: which is indeed the most notorious of all, because all modesty and moderation, but what fear of their necks may suggest, is laid aside, and all become a prey to them that fall into their hands: To which may be referred all unjust and unreasonable and tyrannical Laws, extorting from Subjects that which no cause requires: of which Esay complaineth, *Thy Princes are rebellious, and companions of Thieves*: And probably may intend to condemn all excessive Fees of Lawyers and Physicians, who though they directly rob not men of what is theirs, yet discover such unsatisfiedness and ravenousness in their Offices, that unless they find unconscionable consideration for their pains, they will neglect the trust put in them.

Secondly, to clandestine frauds and couzenages, which are committed sundry wayes: 1. By direct stealing from another his Goods; which being privily acted, is called properly *Thievery*: against which God hath specially declared in *Exodus 2. v. 2. &c.* And it is either against the Publick, and is called *Peculatus*, or *Pillaging*; when a man robs the Common Stock, or uses artifices to refuse to pay those legal dues of Custom or Tribute, or other just Taxes made legal by good Authority. Many men think it scarce any sin, which in truth is a notorious one, to cheat the Civil Powers of what is due to them: but Solomon implyeth the contrary when he saith, *Who so robbeth his Father or his Mother, and saith it is no transgression, the*



*the same is companion of a destroyer.* And Christ commandeth by St. Paul, Rom. 13. to all their dues: *tribute to whom tribute is due, custom to whom custom, fear to whom fear, honour to whom honour.* So that there seems to be, and really is a justice in giving outward reverence and honour to our Superiours: and rudely and stoutly to deny them this, is to rob them of their dues before God, and to offend against this Commandment.

Thirdly, not to pay what we owe, and according to the Circumstances we owe any thing to another, and especially to detain the wages of the hireling or labourer from him, *Lev. 19. 13. James 5. 4.* which will cry against the hard Master who delayeth to pay what is earnt according to agreement: For as Casuists hath observed, He that payeth not exactly according to the known custom and rule, though he afterwards payeth all in kind, yet in effect he doth not pay all was due, seeing many inconveniencies do commonly happen to the damage of the Creditour upon such delays. But that which is most intolerable and unjust, is the too common craft of covetous and wicked minds, to withhold, or refuse due payment of debts upon many vain and unconscionable pretences, so long till the Creditour becoming almost desperate of that debt, shall be wrought upon by fear, to abate of his due, least he should loose all. They who do not pay according to the agreed time, ought rather to adde for satisfaction of so long detaining to their debt, than to make new capitulations whereby the principal sum should be impaired, to the loss of the Creditour.

Fourthly, to use adulterations in Commodities, contrary to the common rule and expectations of men, is a sort of stealing and injustice here condemned: as to mix and corrupt Wines, Siders, Money; Bread, or, after the manner of Druggists and Apothecaries, to sophisticate any Drugg or Liquor, or to counterfeite any more precious thing with a viler and baser; is to commit an offence against this Command, and no better than stealing in the eyes of God, how customary soever this may be, and with a seared Conscience, and bold face carried on. Nay frequently this is worse a great deal than simple filching and stealing, in that the bodies of men are often by such sophistications, if not poysoned, yet corrupted, and so ends in a degree of murder: and if not for the present and particular mischief, yet for the general and gentle, deserves the halter and hell no less than direct Thieves and Murderers.

Fifthly, Sacriledge, and open, or subtile or private alienation of what is devoted to sacred and common ends of Religion, and usurping the same to a mans private secular use, against the intention of the thing, hath this double aggravation above common simple theft: First, in that what was designed for publick uses and ends, is perverted to particular: For example, Endowments and Donations made to Churches, serve not only to the maintenance of that Person, who in that capacity possesse them, but to the benefit and comfort of all in that district communicating in Spiritual things: wrong is done unto all them, who upon the withdrawing of such due support, want their due ministrations. Secondly, in ordinary thefts or injustice, the matter passeth but from secular to secular ends; but in Sacrilegious Thefts, it passeth from one kind to another: from Spiritual to Secular or Temporal, besides the particular injury done to the Person to whom it is due.

And whereas it is said in defense of Sacriledge, that the owners of such Spiritual Maintenances abuse them themselves by lazy, luxurious, and other vicious courses, contrary to the true end of them; all this may be

granted and lamented ; But they who preach up vertue out of such wicked principles and ends, should withal consider how this involves the secular as well as spiritual Person. For no man hath any legal temporal Right to any estate so far, as that it should prejudice the common good. And if upon vitiousness of the one, the estate he owneth may be alienated, will it not hold good in the other ? And have not the King and Judicial Courts as great power over Temporal estates as Ecclesiastical ? We can give many instances sacred and humane, whereby it should seem he hath greater. And would these zealous men for vertuous and sober life, hold it reasonable the Estates of Spendthrifts, and Drunkards, and Whoremasters should be taken from them by violence, and given to soberer men ? I would fain see the disparity. This scarce any but sees, to the advantage of Ecclesiastical revenues above Secular : That if the Party possessing them committeth Treason against his Sovereign, neither Religion nor Common Laws do adjudge such Estates to be confiscated to the Crown, as they do others, which argues that Ecclesiastical Estates are put more out of the Kings power than are Secular ; and therefore more unreasonably are seized on than these. It is true, the King is in a more immediate way a *Guardian* and *Protector* of Church-estates, than of the Secular : but Guardians have no more Interest or intrinseck Right to the Estate they dispose of to the true owner, than they have of other mens. Or does it at all extenuate the crime, that frequently it is committed against such persons as cannot help themselves ? Yet even cold Friends to the Churches Right in such Cases, hath observed and been constrained to confess, that the displeasure, or to speak without mincing, the Curse of God hath pursued those more then ordinary, and egregiously frustrated their hopes and expectations, who have fingered or grasped Church possessions : great usurpations of this kind serving no farther, and doing no more good, than a Jugg of Beer doth a good Fellow. I will favour mine own Country so far, as to forbear all instances might here be given, and only mention that I find in *Paggins*. *Petrus de Vineis an Italian, and prudent Counsellor, and Secretary to Frederick the Emperour, called Barbarossa, who had wars with Pope Alexander the Third, and advanced far into Italy against him, was by the calumnies of the Barbaria Faction, intimate and prevalent with the Emperour, turned out of office, and had for his punishment both his eyes put out. But the Emperour afterward being convinced of the wrong he had done him, received him to favour again : and being at Pisa, on wards of his way against the Pope, and much pressed with straits how to pay his Army, took this Peter into Counsel what he should do to raise moneys : Peter answered, Your war being against the Church, it is good policie and reason to make use of the wealth of it against it self ; and therefore should do well to seize on the rich plate, and wealth of the Churches of Pisa, and convert them to your service. The Emperour liked the advice very well : and accordingly spoiled the Churches of their riches, and so raised an Army. Which when Peter heard, he came boldly to the Emperour, and said ; Now I am revenged sufficiently of you for my two eyes. You stirred up to your self the hatred of men, but I have made God your enemy through your Sacriledge. From this time forward all things will go worse and worse with you. And so it fell out, for Alexander at length brought down his pride and him to great shame and misery, even to be kicked by the Pope.*

But

But thirdly, he that would understand the heinousness of the sin of Theft, and the heinousness of all Thefts, Sacriledge, may for his satisfaction find infinite examples of saddest nature of Gods vengeance against it: and the Scriptures thus declareth against them: *Ecclesiasticus* 34. 11. *Habakkuk* 2. 6. *Proverbs* 10. 2. *Esay* 61. 8. *Habakkuk* 2. 9. &c.

There yet remains one more abomination to God, under this Commandment, and that is, abuse and injustice in weights and measures, contrary to the Law of Nature, God, and common Commerce, which is thereby destroyed. God saith in *Deuteronomie*, *Thou shalt not have in thy baggs diverse weights, a great, and a small: Thou shalt not have in thine house divers measures, a great and a small: But thou shalt have a perfect and a just weight, a perfect and a just measure shalt thou have; that thy days may be lengthened in the Land which the Lord thy God giveth thee: For all that do such things, and all that do unrighteously, are abomination unto the Lord thy God.* And so in *Leviticus*; *Ye shall do no unrighteousness in judgment, in meteyard, in weight, or in measure. Just weights, just balances, &c.* upon which words *Paulus Fagius* notes out of Jewish Doctours, a fivefold iniquity committed by him that offends in weights and measures. 1. *He pollutes the Land.* 2. *He abuses or prophanes the name of God.* 3. *He causes Gods Majesty, Glory, and Presence to forsake the place.* 4. *Causes Israel to fall by the Sword.* 5. *Causes them to be driven into Exile, in a strange Land.* Adde hereunto what *Solomon* saith against this wicked practise, *Proverbs* 11. v. 1. and *Prov.* 20. 23. as abominable in the eyes of God above other sins: This kind of cheating hath more aggravations of villany than I can stand here to enumerate: It is worse then downright common filching, stealing, and robbing upon the High-way, because it extends to innumerable persons more than they do: and is seldomer a great deal repented of, and consequently more damnable: For (as the Psalmist saith) *he flattereth himself in his own eyes till his iniquity be found to be hateful.* And being infatuated with the stupifying charm of present gain, supposeth too often that if he civilly hears Sermons, and hath recourse at the last to the Doctrine of Justifying Faith, all scores between him and God will be quitted. But how much happier, how much honefter, how much holier are they who loose their ears in the publick Pillory, than such solemn and grave Cheats in their Shops, who loose their souls? customariness and commonness extenuating the sin; and the course of trading, and art of growing rich apace, as requiring, so almost justifying such abominations. But no more, though not enough of this.

We are now briefly to touch and recommend to the true Christian practise, not only justice in doing right to all men, but doing good to all men, as the Apostle exhorteth: and the Rule of Contraries in expounding the Commandments, which is, that *where a Sin is forbidden expressly, there implicitly is a vertue commanded*, as where a vertue is enjoined, there the contrary vice is much more interdicted. And surely the first place is here to be given to repentance, and repentance of such sin as this doth indispenably require restitution or satisfaction; without which, if men did not tacitly hold they might be saved by the common false notion of Justifying Faith, so many would not shipwrack their Souls and Consciences in acting, living, and dying in such unjust wayes as are above mentioned. Of Satisfaction and Restitution we have already spoken, as necessary to Repentance, as Repentance is necessary to Salvation; and this satisfaction not as relating to God, but unto Man wronged: And therefore I shall more fully give Saint *Augustine's* judgment in the Case, and so leave it:

In

*Deut.* 25. 13,  
14, 15.

*Lev.* 19. 35.

*Psal.* 36. 2.

*Gal.* 6. 10.



Aug. Ep. 54. In his Epistle to the *Macedonians*, he writeth thus: *If what belongs to another, the ground of the sin, be not restored, when it may be restored; Repentance is counterfeited, and not real: But if it be real, the sin will never be forgiven, unless there be a restitution of the thing ill gotten, but as I said, where it can be restored.*

Prov. 3. 27.

But besides and above this, acts of Mercy and Charity are here required of all good Christians: and not only to keep our hands from any open or clandestine violence to others, but to extend and open our hands to the benefit and comfort of others. Not only are we forbidden to take what is not our own, but to keep what is our own, so to our selves, that the exigencies of our brother and neighbour requiring, we should withhold it from him. *Withhold not good from them to whom it is due* (saith God) *when it is in the power of thine hand to do it.* And in case of the distress of thy brother, that thou hast is in some measure due to him, in the eyes of God, and by his Law of Charity, though not by the Law of the Land.

ð. IX.

Luke 10.

In the Ninth Commandment it is said, *Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy Neighbour.* What is meant by *Neighbour*, our Saviour Christ informs us in the Gospel, extending it to all in common civil society with us. And as in the preceding Commandments, God required that we should not wrong our Neighbour in evil acts or deeds, so here doth he prohibit us from doing him any wrong in word. Which word is primarily meant of wrong in Judgment, when men are called to testify to the truth of a matter, they by no means should deliver against their Neighbour what is false: which may be done three ways; First, by false accusations and charges of facts or crimes not committed, contrary to Gods word, *Lev. 19. 16. Thou shalt not go up and down as a Tale-bearer among thy people: neither shalt thou stand against the blood of thy Neighbour: I am the Lord.* And this false dealing in Judgment may be committed three wayes, as the Annotatour on *Gratian* hath observed: *For false Accusers* (saith he) *either slander by bringing false crimes; or prevaricate by concealing true crimes; or commit tergiversation in quite relinquishing the charge.* All which are enemies to justice and truth here commanded. A second offence in Judgment is in the person of a Witness to affirm a falsity, or deny a truth. A third is, to give a wrong sentence in the office and place of a Judge; forbidden by God so severely and frequently; and particularly in *Leviticus: Ye shall do no unrighteousness in judgment: thou shalt not respect the person of the poor, nor honour the person of the mighty: but in righteousness shalt thou judge thy Neighbour.*

Lev. 19. 16.  
Accusatorum te-  
meritas tribus  
modis detegi-  
tur: tribus po-  
nis subicitur.  
Aut enim ex-  
lumniantur, aut  
prevaricantur,  
aut tergiver-  
santur, &c.  
Annot. in  
Grot. Par. 2.  
Cau. 2. Q. 3.  
Lev. 19. 15.

Prov. 22.  
Eccle. 10. 11.  
Differunt su-  
surratio & de-  
tractio in fine.  
Nam principa-  
lis intentio de-  
tractoris est  
famam proximi  
denigrare —  
Susurronis au-  
tem intentio  
principalis est  
illum cui sic  
invidet, per  
mala que de eo  
dicit ab amici-  
tia aliorum se-  
parare. Gerson  
de 7 Vitiis  
Capitalib.

And in common conversation men offend against this Law several wayes:  
1. By detraction or defamation of our Neighbour, whereby properly a man endeavours to lessen and bring to nothing the worthy parts or deeds of him; and to amplify and aggravate his faults and failings, to the diminution of his reputation. But Solomon tells us, *A good name is better than precious oymntment.* Of him likewise we read in *Ecclesiastes: Surely the serpent will bite without incantment, and a babler is no better:* He smiteth, stingeth, woundeth, and destroyeth as a Serpent or Adder, before he be discovered; and hath his name, as he doth the office, of the old Serpent, who hath the name of Devil in the Greek and Latin Tongues, from his mischievous slaundering of God and Man. He differeth from the Talebearer or *Susurro* (of which before) as Gerson observeth, in the end: *For the chief end of the Detraitor or Slaunderer is to slur the reputation of his Neighbour — But the chief end of the Whisperer or Talebearer is to alienate him whom he envies, from the esteem and friendship of another, by the evil he speaks of him.* Which seems

seems to be grounded on *Solomon, Proverb. 16. 28. A froward man soweth strife; and a whisperer separateth chief friends.* And the same more fully and particularly by *Solomon, Prov. 6. v. 14.* declaring how God hateth him that soweth discord, and *v. 19. A false witness that speaketh lies, and him that soweth discord among brethren.*

Another sort of offenders, are on the contrary, *Flatterers* and *Dissemlers* with God or Man, whose lips are all oyl, and their hearts gall and vinegar; or if they should not intend any great mischief directly, yet by idle and unreasonable, soft and smooth language, they corrupt and poyson the minds of their hearers with a vain opinion of themselves to the conceiving of Pride, and bringing forth folly, and running into so many evils which an open enemy could not have brought upon them: Of these therefore speaketh *Solomon* also, *Faithful are the wounds of a friend, but the kisses of an enemy are deceitful.* But of all flattery, none so abominable to God, or pernicious to Man, as that of Religion, in soothing men up in wicked known sins, for some special quality or singularity of believing and worshipping, which upon tryal, will not all prove worth a straws end; whereas the most material parts of Religion, as Humility, Charity, Unity, Obedience of unquestionable worth and excellencie, are trampled on as of no use, or rather hinderances to sinister and vile ends. Murmurers likewise and Complainers, may well be brought under the lash of this Law: who, upon every frivolous and light exception or defect in their Governours, are restless, unquiet, discontented, envious, mutinous, factious, and given to alienate the hearts of the Inferiours from their Superiours, by suggesting many groundless fears and suspicions, and putting in Caveats against them, and all this while with very specious pretexts of zeal for truth, and the publick good: As did *Dathan, Corah, and Abiram* against *Moses* and *Aaron*; as did *Aaron* and *Miriam* against *Moses*; and as did *Absolom* against *David*; and sometimes the whole Congregation of *Israel* against their Governours: which one would have thought, being the body of the People (which some make the true Supream Power) might have passed for Right and Reasonable. *St. Paul* knowing that the Light and Faith of the Gospel seldom masters mens corrupt natures and inclinations so far as to secure them in innocencie from such evils, advertises Christians from their examples to beware of such sins; saying, *Neither murmur ye as some of them also murmured, and were destroyed of the destroyer.* And such are they also who raise false reports, and raise or spread false news of no small consequence many times, without any tolerable grounds. Prov. 27. 6.

But last of all, to this belongs the sin of Lying in general, even when it is not accompanied with the mischiefs aforesaid of Detraction or Slandering. *A lye*, saith *St. Augustine* well, *Est falsa significatio cum voluntate fallendi; is a false signification, with an intent to deceive.* Where we must first distinguish between *Lying* and *Telling a Lye*. He that tells a lye may not lye, but speak truth: for it may be true that such a lye as is reported, was told: but to lye, it is not necessary a man should make a lye, for it suffices he tells that for truth which he either knows, or believes to be false, though it were invented by another; yea, though it should prove true. Again, this signification may as well be in *work, act, or sign* outward, whereby such a thing is commonly understood, and is intended should be the signifier of his mind; 1 Cor. 10. 10.

*Aug. de Mend. ad Con- sen. cap. 12. Quantum in ipso est, mentitur ille qui dicit verum quod putat falsum. Quantum enim ad animum ejus attinet, quia non quod sit hoc dicit, non verum dicit quamvis verum inveniatur esse quod dicit: nec ullo modo liber est a mendacio, qui ore nesciens verum loquitur: sciens autem voluntate mentitur.* Id. Enchirid. cap. 18.

and

*Qui sic loquitur ut credit, est vera non loquitur, fideliter loquitur, qui autem non credit quæ loquitur, est vera loquitur, infideliter loquitur.* Aug Ep.

135.  
Item Enchiridio ad Laurentium, cap. 18.

*Nisi subri mendacio Consul fugere hostes ab cornu altero clamitans concitasset aciem, &c.* Livius lib. 2.

Aug. ad Confess. Tom. 4. cap. 9. De Mendacio. Pro salute quorundam mentimur: Peccatum ergo est si veniale: quod benevolentia excusatur. Aug in Enchiridio ad Laurent. cap. 22.

and in such manner be so taken, as if that thing were which really is not. For otherwise a man could not lye to a deaf man, which certainly he may as well as to a blind man. And yet farther, Not every thing that we say of, and from our selves, as true, is a lye though it be false: Why? because according to this definition a man must willingly and studiously design the belief of what is false, to make it a proper lye: For if he believes sincerely, he speaks truth; and intends no otherwise to be credited by another, he doth not lye, saith *Austin*, any more than he steals, who taketh that which belongs to another man, as his own; presuming without fraud or wilful error, that it is so: or he committeth adultery, who contrary to his intentions and will, useth another woman, as his wife. Yet may all these partake of the sin of their respective kinds, when that due and sober attention is neglected which may inform a man better: for if there are offered unto him competent means of knowing the truth, and judging more faithfully, and these not being worthily improved, the error doth redound to the will, and that weak and general intention can neither excuse from a lye or Adultery, or Idolatry. Lastly, not the intention of telling a lye doth absolutely constitute a lyer, but the intention and will to be believed, as true. For of the Three kinds of Lyes frequent amongst Schoolmen, and other, The *Officious Lye*, The *Pernicious Lye*, and The *Merry and Jesting Lye*: The Two first are alwayes Lyes properly taken. The Second alwayes, and without all doubt, evil: The first may in some cases be commendable: as killing of a man may be; when the ground is just, and the case deserves death, one may be put to death by another, with the warrant of legal Authority: And that a man may not deceive that man whom he may lawfully kill, wants proof: I mean by a simple lye, wherein the Name of God is not used or taken in vain. For though such case may be put in which a man may ruin him with a lye, whom he may slay with the sword, or strangle with an halter, being lawfully required; yet must not God be so far abused, or his sacred Name prophaned, as to be brought to attest a falsity. We find none of those holy or eminent persons in Scripture that are brought for to authorize lying, who committed this great error. I shall by an Instance out of *Livie* express my meaning, who tells us that the Volscians and the Romans being in fight, the Roman army began to give way, and turn their backs, and all had like to have been lost, had not the Consul by a saving Lye cryed out aloud, from the other Wing, and said, That the Enemies fled, and were running away; and thereby encouraged his Army to fall on again with greater violence, and so get the victory. And if to destroy a man, may not the same be done to save a Life, and that a mans own; no prejudice thereby happening to others? It will be said, A man must not commit a sin to save his life: And to this it will be answered by granting, all is said. But they, who defend such an officious lye, do deny it, under those Circumstances, to be a Sin. *Augustine* in the Treatise above mentioned, affirmeth a Lye to be lawful to the end thereby the evil carnal pollution may be avoided scarce otherwise: And no man more rigorous than he, and he scarce less constant in any thing then that: For in the Third Chapter of the said Treatise, he declares That in no case a lye is to be endured, for the good event it may have. And yet in his *Enchiridion* he saith, We lye for the safety of some men: It is therefore a sin, but a venial one: which good meaning excuses. What *Austine* meant by a Venial sin is not very clear; but that he extended it not so far as moderne Divines, is to me clear. But in his Ennarration of the Sixth Psalm, he directly holds that *Jocosum Mendacium* is not a sin; which



which is certainly the truth: when a man doth not speak a thing to the end he may be believed, but for recreation. This may come under the reprehension of Saint Paul to the *Ephesians*, advising that *Neither filthiness, nor foolish talking, nor jesting, which are not convenient*, should be used, but rather giving of thanks; but not as the particular sin of lying, of which we now speak.

Ephes. 5. 4.

But Mr. Perkins would prove such lying in jest a sin: 1. *Because though it hurts not our neighbour, yet it is to the hurt and prejudice of truth.* This is new, & too subtle, seeing Truth abstractly taken is inviolable & invulnerable, as God himself is, who is Truth: And therefore truth is then only wronged when some person is wronged for want of Truth and Justice: Darknes doth not hurt the light, but such persons only or things as are bereaved of it. But thus to tell a lye, is to tell a pernicious lye; which plainly was St. *Austins* mind, who saith, *Omnis autem qui mentitur, ea contra id quod animo sentit, loquitur.* Id. ib. 2. He saith, *But men are deceived hereby.* But first we solimit the innocencie of *Jocular Lyes*, that they be not spoken seriously, or with any intention to deceive. Secondly, He himself grants it lawful to deceive by dissimulation, or simulation of what is not intended in some cases: as in the case of God threatening the abolition of the Israelites, *Exod. 32. v. 10.* And of *Josuah* counterfeiting a flight before *Ay*, *Josb. 8. 5, 6.* and of Physicians deceiving averse and unruly Patients. And how can this possibly stand with that opinion? 3. *He that tells a lye hurts himself, though it be for the good of others; for when he speaks the truth indeed, he is less believed.* This is true when a man tells a lye indeed, but not when he professes not to speak truth. 4. *There ought to be a conformity between the speech and mind, which is not when a lye is uttered.* This rule fails in many cases: For if a man minds, or intends to do another a mischief, must he necessarily speak conformably, or do conformably, and make good his bad intentions? If a man intends to do one a kindness, and give him an estate, may he not carry himself towards him, and all others, as if he never intended any such thing? But it may be he would restrain this to positive Speeches and Acts, which he would have alwayes conformable to inward conceptions: And so they are when a man intends to deceive, and doth deceive. But that the general appearances must conform to the reality of the Intention, his own concessions above-noted will not admit. It is true therefore only, when it is justly required. And this suffices to cut the throat of all (as they are now called deservedly) Jesuitical *Æquivocations*, and Mental Reservations, and External dissimulations; viz. because none of their real or pretended Superiours can give them any power not to answer according to the serious intention and expectation of legal Enquirers: and legal Enquirers they are, who have legal Authority in that Nation. Again, unless their Superiours can give them power of Life and Death (as it is an opinion amongst them they may, especially the Pope) over free Princes and their Subjects, they can give them no power to deceive by positive acts or words, lawful Powers, contrary to the common and received sense and meaning of Enquiries and Answers. Thirdly, neither of a mans self, nor by any Civil Authority, how great or good soever, nor upon any Case how important soever, can a man lawfully use the Name of God in attestation of what is false, or confirmation of what his Conscience and Judgment assures him is otherwise than he declares it to be. Neither can any man give instance that God ever permitted it, or any good or holy man in Scripture presumed to do so. And therefore *equivocation* in any oaths, whether lawfully or unlawfully administred, is directly unlawful, and to be detested of all men, as it is of God.

Perkins on Galat. ch. 1. v. 20.

Y y y The

The Vertue then which this Commandment requires in opposition to bearing false witness, is first, a love and veneration of Truth, as the sacred daughter of God himself, and that in all things, and at all times not excepted, but more especially Authority and publick Justice requiring it. The Inducements hereunto, abbreviated, *Perkins* hath collected thus to my hands in the forementioned place: 1. *Gods command: James 3. 14.* 2. *Lying is a conformity to the Devil.* 3. *We are sanctified by the word of truth, John 17. 17.* 4. *Truth is a Fruit of Gods Spirit, Galat. 5.* A mark of Gods children, *Psal. 32. 2. and 15. 2.* 5. *Destruction is the reward of a Liar, Psal. 5. 6.* And thus far of the Ninth Commandment.

ð. X.

The Tenth is, *Thou shalt not covet thy neighbours house, Thou shalt not covet thy neighbours wife, nor his servant, nor his maid, nor his Ox nor his Ass, nor any thing that is his.* Which the modern Roman Church having carefully turned the second out of doors, as a quarrelsome and troublesome companion, are necessitated to divide into two, to make up the compleat number of Ten: For which fact they have no ground but *St. Austin*, and them who precisely followed him. But none of these, or any ancient, proceeded on their grounds, *viz. because the Second Commandment gave offence.* Now, seeing many more in number and antiquity have otherwise than *Austin*, considered this Commandment as one entirely: The Reasons why they so judge of it are worth enquiring: For some eminently learned among them, especially in the Scriptures, have declared expressly against it, as *Oleaster* and *Mercerus*; *Petrus Galatinus* inclining that way, as *Buxtorf* hath observed. And, as a little before he hath noted, the Jewish Doctors, who are to sway much in this Case (unless the Papists please to distinguish the Decalogue, as they have audaciously the Canon of the Scriptures of the Old Testament, into *Jewish* and *Christian*, or *Ecclesiastical*) have unanimously conspired to make this but one Commandment. *Aben Ezra* and *Abarbenel* mentions indeed such an opinion as the Roman Church maintains, but rejects the same, as a very fond and vain conceit. And the like may be said of *Estius* his answers and evasions of the reasons on our side: which are First, That the object of the sin here forbidden is not to distinguish the Command so much, as the Act, Concupiscence, of the mind or heart united in one: because then we should have more than two: One prohibiting lusting after another mans wife; another lusting after his Servants; another lusting or coveting his cattle; and a fourth his possessions and moveables. But *St. Paul* speaking of this Concupiscence maketh it but one, where he saith, *I had not known lust except the Law had said, Thou shalt not covet.* The other Precepts therefore having provided against the Acts outward of sin; This in the Conclusion goeth, as it were, over all of them again, and interdicteth all inward motions towards any of the sins before forbidden. To say therefore with *Estius*, *St. Paul* saith, *Thou shalt not lust, is as much as if a man should say, Thou shalt love, which doth not make all the Commandments but one, is very idle:* seeing the word *Lust* is there taken in an evil sense, and may reasonably extend to all the Negative precepts at least; as Love doth concern them all, and is the sum of the Decalogue. But we find no such particular Precept as *Love*, indefinitely taken. And besides, we are not so much to enquire after matter of Right, what might be, or ought to be, but of fact, what is. And to collect what is done, we are not so much to consult the holy Writ of the New Testament, which uses no precise or determinate speech in reference to the number or order of these Commandments, but the thing it self, whichever amongst the Jews was thus distinguished, as we do,

Buxtorf. de  
Decal. num.  
74. & 59.

Estius in  
Sentent. l. 3.  
Dist. 40. §. 3.

Rom. 7.

do, and generally the Greek Church, and the Latin likewise, until *Austin's* dayes. And it is certain, the Holy Spirit here doth not affect Logical Divisions, or Rhetorical Partitions or Methods, but delivers things grossly to a rude people, inculcating the same thing under diverse forms of speech: For according to one of the Rules of expounding the Decalogue, *viz. That where the outward act is forbidden, the inward act is also forbidden; and where the Effect, there the Cause is also forbidden*; this should rather seem to be none other Precept than what went before, in the seventh and eighth Commandments forbidding Adultery and Theft: and by Implication, the inward acts of Lust after the Persons or Possessions of others: For that is the beginning and cause of those outward Effects, and scandalous sins.

Another Reason for the entireness of that we call the *Tenth Commandment*, is the order observed in *Exodus*: where *Lusting* after our Neighbours House, is set before *Lusting* after his Wife, or other Persons: and then again follow his Goods; which shows that there was no intention to divide that Period into two Precepts: For then, in all probability, the Persons should have been ranked by themselves, and the Goods by themselves, so to distinguish them: but no heed being given to this, no intention seems to be for that. To this they answer most colourably, *That in Deuteronomy the order is otherwise: Coveting ones Neighbours wife being first prohibited: and that the Law as there repeated, and revised, is to be a President to us.* But first the contrary to this is most true, That the Law was more exactly delivered in *Exodus* than in *Deuteronomie*, in all those points which are in common to them, as hath been shewed out of *Grotius*: For *Deuteronomy*, according to its Name, being indeed a Repetition, in a compendious manner, of what was more expressly and at large handled in the four first Books of *Moses*, it cannot be supposed but many, if not all things, should be in them more plainly and accurately treated of, than in this. For as *St. Augustine* hath observed of the diverse manner of reciting the Lords Prayer in Saint *Matthews* Gospel and *St. Lukes*: *St. Matthew* setting down seven Petitions, and *St. Luke* but five, and thereupon directs us to make *St. Matthews* words the Rule of understanding *St. Lukes*: So questionless where a thing in the Pentateuch is more distinctly and fully expressed, there ought we to take our measures for the interpretation of what is more confusedly or briefly rehearsed elsewhere: and by consequence the Law in *Deuteronomy* is to be regulated by that of *Exodus*. But farther: The order of persons or things is not in *Deuteronomie* observed: For first it is said, *Thou shalt not desire thy Neighbours Wife*: then, *Neither shalt thou covet thy Neighbours House*: and then follows, *his Servants*, and then again *his Goods*: which shew that God would not have us too rigorously to seek for methods in his word, but matter.

Therefore the sum of all is this, That God knowing how imperfect mans understanding was, in the matter wherein his senses were concerned; and how willing he was to be deceived and ignorant of his duty; and lastly, how prone a man is to proceed from evil thoughts to evil deeds, he doth here inform his people in an higher point of Sobriety and Justice than Gentile Philosophers, or common light of Nature could direct men. For Saint *Paul* saith, *he had not known lust* [to be a sin] *except the Law had said, Thou shalt not covet*: And our Saviour in the Gospel interdicteth all vain and lascivious looks, whereby Lust may be conceived: The reason of all which is this, because, as (the Scripture often intimates unto us) God accepteth the heart for the act, and the will for the deed, where there is a defect of power to bring things to perfection which are righteous and holy; so doth God

Deut. 5.21.

*Evangelista  
autem Lucas in  
oratione Do-  
minica Petiti-  
ones non septem  
sed quinque  
complexus est,  
&c. Aug. En-  
chirid. ad  
Laurent. cap.  
115.*

Rom. 7.7.  
Matth. 5.28.



Οὐδὲν δὲ  
καὶ δὲ ἀδύ-  
νατον τὸ κα-  
κῶ. Basil.  
Mag.

Per hoc etiam  
si minora mala  
faciant, quia  
minus possunt,  
non minus ta-  
men mali sunt,  
quia nolent  
minus esse si  
possent.

Neque enim ea  
dimitti nobis  
volumus, quae  
dimissa non  
dubitamus in  
baptismo, sed  
illa, &c. Aug.  
Epist. 108.

judge that Evil to be done against him, which is so conceived and resolved upon in the mind, as to want nothing but ability and opportunity to put in execution. For as an holy Father saith, *No man is righteous who cannot do amis.* And as another speaks of wicked mens inclinations; *By this, though peradventure they commit lessevil, they are no less evil; because they would not be less wicked, if they could tell how to shift it:* Thus Salvian.

And necessary was this Commandment, not only for the reasons now given, but also for the general pronity of all men to fall into this sin. All men naturally having this unnatural (called sometimes for the commonness, *Natural*) Concupiscence in them, inclining and urging them to evil: none but Christ himself (not the *Virgin Mary*) being exempted from it, in the root and first seed called, *Original sin*. But *Original sin* is not here forbidden, as that which surprises a man inevitably, and cannot possibly be prevented: but the actuating or drawing that evil principle which lurks in our nature forth to particular evil motions of the will. For as St. *Austine* hath observed, *We do not pray God to forgive us those sins which we doubt not but are forgiven in baptism, but those which through human frailty creep upon us unawares, which though small, are frequent.* So are we not here advised to pray against, or resist *Original sin*, which is irresistible; but the *vermine* of evil thoughts, which are apt to breed in the remains of natural Concupiscence, as Snakes in a dunghil, which coming to get strength, creep out in evil outward acts, to the endangering of the soul. Hence it is that the Scriptures exhort us to avoid the occasions, and resist the Devil at first; and by Faith to quench these fiery darts of the Devil that shall be shot into our souls: with some of which proper and useful means so to do, I shall conclude this Chapter.

First, the outward occasions of wicked thoughts are carefully and resolutely to be avoided; such as are Idleness, evil Objects, evil Authours, and evil Company. Secondly, Not to give way, to the least friendly entertainment to the first motions or injections of the Tempter, but crush the Cockatrice egg, and quench the spark and growing flame at the very first. For as when an enemy without throws in a Granado into a Fort to ruin it, if they within take it up presently and throw it back again, before it breaks, it confounds the Enemy rather than them in the Fort: so do evil thoughts cast into the Soul by the Devil, rather torment him than hurt the Soul, when they are rejected suddainly and cast out. Thirdly, By being instant and fervent in prayer, whereby God is called to the assistance of the labouring Soul, as some good hand, by crying out, is ready to pull out one sinking in waters. Fourthly, Imploying a mans self constantly and carefully in some laudable and profitable actions, much secures him from the vain illusions of the mind, from whence do spring that Lust of the Flesh, Lust of the Eyes, and Pride of Life, against which St. *John* warns us: and all which with their particular branches are forbidden by this last Commandment.

Wisd. 8.21.  
Matth. 17.21.

## CHAP. XXI.

*Of Superstition contrary to the true Worship of God, and Christian Obedience.*

**A**S Hereſie is a corruption of the Faith or Doctrine of the Church, and Schiſm of its Unity and Chriſtian Communion ſo neceſſary to its well being; ſo is Superſtition a degeneration and corruption of the true worſhip of God, now laſt ſpoken of: And therefore as to the more compleat handling of the two former, we took in their Contraries, *Hereſie* and *Schiſm*, ſo now doth it appear in like manner expedient for the concluſion of the latter, to treat briefly of Superſtition, the Enemy to the true Service of God.

There are two extreams (ſaith *Clemens Alexandrinus*) of Ignorance, Atheiſm and Superſtition. The former is a total Renunciation of a Deity: The latter a vehement and exceſſive addition to a Deity, without judgment or ſobriety; *Fearing Damons or Spirits inſtead of God, and deiſſying every thing*; or miſtaking the worſhip of the true God.

And to make a fuller diſcovery, we ſhall not much trouble our ſelves with the various acceptations or uſes of the word, *Superſtition*: Whether it is derived from *Supra ſtatutum*, or *Supra ſtare*, it matters but little, provided we can arrive to the due knowledge of the thing intended by that word: which men have endeavoured of late to render very uncertain and mutable, as their ſeveral opinions, and fears, and intereſts of Religion lead them. But undoubtedly, Superſtition is a Religious Paſſion of the mind, as Atheiſm is a Paſſion of the Inferiour Senſes, and a Stupidity of the Mind, as *Clemens Alexandrinus* now cited, truly tearms it. Now, what Paſſion can it be ſo properly called as Fear in exceſs; and Fear not directed to Man but God; not cowardiſe, but confuſion: It may be answerable to the deſcription given us by the Wiſeman in theſe words: *Wickedneſs condemned by her own witneſs is very timorous, and being preſſed with Conſcience, alwayes forecaſteth grievous things. For fear is nothing elſe but the betraying of the ſuccours which reaſon offereth.* And we know the moſt generally received word with the Greeks, expreſſing Superſtition, is compounded of a word ſignifying Fear [*Δηνδαμονία.*] The Latine word which we retain in our Language, *Superſtition*, comes very much ſhort in ſignificancie to the Greek: For that implyeth in it both the Act of him that is ſuperſtitious, and the Object about which ſuch Superſtition is uſed. And that is a Fear, of ſomewhat of the nature or eſteem of God, *Damons*. Whiſ is not much amiſs: For though Evil Spirits or Good Spirits being the object of our Worſhip inevitably turn it into Superſtition, yet may there be Superſtition in the manner of Worſhip, as well as in the Object, when a man worſhips the true Object, God, in an undue manner. But the Latin word *Superſtition* ſeems to import no more than an error in the choice of our Object, which it maketh to be ſomewhat ſuperviving, even beyond our

*Ἀνεπίστος ἀμαθίας, Ἀ-  
δύναμις καὶ ἀν-  
οιδαιμονία.  
Clem. Alex.*

*Ἀπὸ τοῦ φό-  
βου καὶ τοῦ νομί-  
ζου διὰ τὴν ἀν-  
οιδαιμονίαν ὅ-  
τι διὰ τὴν κα-  
ταβολὴν τῶν  
πάντων συνέ-  
ζου. Id.  
Strom. lib. 7.*

*Wisd. 17. 11,  
12.*

Senses





&c. declaring unto us the dangerous Superstition of engaging in such Worship, for which there is no ground to be seen in his Word, but only in the vain and fleshly mind of man, which is curious in searching into that which is not made known to him of God, and to please himself in such bold inventions. This certainly is Superstition.

But this is not only Superstition, but that also which invents an essential form of Worship, to the prejudice of that truly divine and ordained: and may truly be distinguished into two parts, both of which retain with them inseparably the necessary ingredient of Fear excessive and needless. And the one is a Fear of omitting something judged necessary to be done, though in truth it be not: The other is, a Fear as vain and groundless of committing something necessarily to be avoided, as either unlawful in itself, or interdicted of God, when there is no such matter, though he be loudly told there is. Both these are really Superstitions, the first *Positive*, and the latter *Negative*: being both influenced from Conscience, which terrifies the one to do, and deters the other from doing, without cause, not without suspicion or presumption. For Conscience taken in the Religious sense, cannot be affected but at the apprehension of *Apparent* Good or Evil at the least. And if this be but only an *Apparence*, and not a *Reality*, then is the conscience mistaken, and falls into superstitious acts, and places Religion in those things which are not capable of such high acts. Thus, for instance, If a man should ascribe as much to the worship of the Body given to God, as he doth to the Soul or Heart, he were undoubtedly superstitious in excess. And on the other side, if a man, having heard much of the excellencie of Spiritual Worship above outward or Visible, should think so contemptibly of this and all acts thereof, as unlawful and sinful, or superstitious, without doubt he were notoriously guilty of Superstition: Why? Because, according to his own principles and phrase, he places Religion where God hath not; and makes a conscience of that which God no where willeth him to do: but rather contrariwise, adviseth him to comply with, though not by a particular express Law, by general and implicate. First requiring as really, though not so primarily, bodily acts and outward reverence, as inward and spiritual. Secondly, by endowing his Substitutes, Governours Ecclesiastical with such power, as we have before proved to belong to the Church by Gods concession. And this agrees very well with the most received definition of Superstition amongst Christians, till of very late years, when men having a mind to secure their own stake, and to blast and traduce the opinions of such as think otherwise than they do, fancied and framed to themselves definitions of that and other things, as might best agree with their own persuasions, and impugn their Adversaries. By which unlearned and unjust proceedings, they grossly define Superstition by Popery, it may be, or somewhat else they dislike answerably, and *Popery* by *Superstition*: or a little more regularly, not more truly, by *Will-worship* or *Humane Inventions*: for which there appear (at least to them) no grounds in the Word of God.

But this they are mistaken much in, as well in respect of the Rule, by which they would try and condemn Superstition, as of the Cause, *Humane Prudence*, which they will have no otherwise termed than *Humane Inventions*, when it suits not with their pleasure, which is too commonly called Conscience. For the Scripture hath no where tyed up Christian Authority so strictly, as not to permit it to interpose in any thing concern-

ing

*Improbare quod  
nunquam in-  
probat Deus,  
nimis est ho-  
mini, &c. Cal-  
vinus contr.  
Anabapt. p.  
27. 8°.*

ing the Worship of God, without special and manifest warrant from thence. But the contrary is most certain, that it hath granted so much Liberty to Christian Churches, as to fashion themselves, and modellize their Worship, without fear of incurring the violation of it, or, the offence of God, so far as manifest restraints and inhibitions do not appear to the contrary. And this *Calvin* himself once well noted, if his own Interests would have suffered him to have been constant to what he delivered against the Anabaptists, viz. *To oppose what God never opposed, I must tell you, is more rashness and arrogance than is fit for man: But let us constantly hold to this, that the Authority of God is usurped, when that is condemned which he hath permitted.* They therefore who set their Consciences against those things (be they Rites, Ceremonies, or Traditions, by good Ecclesiastical Authority enjoined) which God hath no where forbidden, do certainly fall into flat Superstition, and that as themselves describe it, though not intend it. For they, without Gods word, frame to themselves Fears and Scruples; They (as the Prophet saith) *Fear where no fear is*, creating Good and Evil out of their own heads, and at their own pleasures; yea contrary, very often, to the exprefs general Licence and Warrant of Gods Word.

And whereas Humane Inventions are much cryed out against, and made very formidable to such superstitious fearful Heads, they are to be earnestly desired to be willing to understand, what we can scarce think them so weak as not to be able to understand; How that in no place either of *Moses* or the Prophets, or the New Testament, *Inventions of Men* are used in an evil sense, but as they imply somewhat rather contrary to, then besides the Divine Precepts. Sometimes they are used for gross defection from Gods prescribed Worship, and for Idolatrous Superstition; and sometimes for opinions and practises inconsistent with Gods Law; as the Traditions of the Jews condemned by Christ in the Gospel. And what is all this, to those usances against which, after more then an hundred years eager search of the Scripture to this evil intent, nothing hath been found or alledged contrary to them; But general exceptions tin'd speciously with Scripture phrases to no real effect? There is no more pernicious Humane Invention than this their fundamental Maxim, *Nothing must be commanded by Man which is not commanded by God*: and, *It is against Christian Liberty to obey Lawful Superiours, but where they show Scripture particularly for what they command*: whereas the truth is, these ought, according to all reason and good conscience, to produce sufficient testimonies of Scripture exempting them from submission, under the guilt of disobedience and superstition too, both plainly condemned by God in his Word, before they oppose themselves to Authority.

*Thom. 22. Q.  
92. 1.*

And to this do well agree the Definition given by *Thomas* of Superstition: *Superstition is a Vice opposite to Religion in the excess or extream: Not that a man can give more of Divine Worship than is due to God; but that he gives Divine Worship either to that he ought not, or in a manner he ought not.* To the first part belong all Direct Idolatry, and all Indirect, such as are Divinations and innumerable vain Observations of superstitious Heads, who from every light unusual occurrence in the Earth, of Beasts; in the Air, of Birds and Fowls; in the Water, or Fire, or Heavens, do collect and conclude unlikely things, to the great disquiet and fear of their mind, their distrust or neglect of Gods Providence, and the forsaking of the common rule of Reason, and the word of God, which ought to regulate

late mens hopes and fears, above all things in the world. To the other appertain both that we call *Positive Superstition*, which is an endless and causeless pursuit of outward sensible acts and ceremonies, to the corrupting of the more sound and necessary part of Religion, starving this, by bestowing all cost and care on that; and seeking to quiet the restless and suspicious mind, by new and vain inventions; in which the Roman Church, and especially the vulgar there, knoweth no mean: And that we term *Negative Superstition*, which on the contrary, thinks every small matter a load unsupportable, which is imposed upon them: thinking it no less necessary to salvation, not to do such things, than the other to observe them: and imagining they cannot serve God in Spirit and in Truth, with such things, as the opposite party suppose they cannot serve God without, when both are false, and both vainly deceived. We may first give an Instance of both in the Indians, as a great Traveller hath reported: *The Indians* (saith he) *adjacent to the River Ganges impute such Worth, and Sanctity to it, that they believed, it washed them from all their sins, and value it as the best water in the world: for which reason the Portugals hate it extreemly, and will not, but upon great necessity, make use of it; a superstitious humor.* This is exactly the Case between the superstitious Papist, and the superstitious Puritan. The Papists have sundry Intolerable superstitions next to Idolatry; of these we speak not: They have likewise many ancient and laudable Rites and Ceremonies, innocent in themselves, and very useful to Christians, being not extolled above their Nature and Office; which are to be subservient to, and not to domineer over the more material part of Religion, to the extinguishing or oppressing of it. But they being advanced to such an unreasonable and dangerous esteem with them; the Puritans fearful Religion tells him, he can never sufficiently quit himself of them, nor detest the number and nature of them enough; this is their superstitious humor too. *Calvin* in the treatise even now mentioned, disputing against the Anabaptists, who opposed Pedobaptism, or Baptism of Children, argueth from the antiquity of the practice: against which, because they were wont to put in an exception, as not Scriptural, but rather Popish, he proceedeth to shew, that *It was not brought in under the reign of the Pope* — which (saith he) *I thought good to touch, for no other reason, but because I would advertise the simpler sort, that these Fanatiques do impudently slander, when they would persuade men that this so eminent Observation, is a new Superstition, and feign it to proceed from the Pope; whereas the universal Church held it before it understood what the Popes Kingdom meant, or had heard any thing at all of it.* Thus he. And how many Rites and Customs do the Fanatiques now-a-days detest and declaim against right loudly, and ignorantly; because they hear (and that many times by most false and vain Relaters) that Popish Churches do use them, as if they were the Authors and inventors of them, who received most of their ancientest Ceremonies, (as they did the Scriptures and Councils themselves) from the Eastern Churches: and that before the Roman Church ever so much as pretended to that Power, or was infected with that Leaven it now is. And this doth plainly appear to any unprejudiced eye, able to read but a little way into the monuments of the Church. And I remember to have been within hearing of a great Zealot, but, God knows, of little knowledge, preaching up his Directory, and consenting and advising, that the Three Creeds now in our Liturgy, should be taken into the Body of the Directory, to garnish it, as his own word was. But because they were not pure Scripture, and were admitted

Vincent le  
Blanch Trav.  
Par. 1.

Calv. contra  
Anabapt. p. 8.  
in 8°.

Ut simplices  
commonefaci-  
am, ut Fanati-  
cos impudenter  
calumniari, &c.



Seneca de  
Ira. l. 2. c. 12.

*Superstitio, qua  
qui est imbutus,  
quietus esse  
nunquam posset.*  
Cicero de  
Natur. D. l. 1.

Maimonides  
de Idol. cap. 2.  
§. 4.

ted into the impure Missal, what should be here done? He resolved this, by saying, there was no great danger herein, because these were not made nor brought in by the Pope: but *they were in use before the Pope was Antichrist*. It were to be wished they would extend this somewhat farther: and the greatest number of grievances and superstitious scruples would easily vanish. But truly said *Seneca* of such persons, *Vana vanis terrori sunt*. Vain men are soon scar'd with vain things, especially where there shall be invented such a supream piece of Religion, which shall perswade men, that the more full of exceptions, doubts, scruples and fears, the more godly, and the more tender Conscienced men; not distinguishing between a sore Conscience, and a tender one: nor a distemper'd one, and a quick-sens'd. We know very well that they who are sick, are soonest awaked: and those parts that are inflam'd and swell'd with corruption are most tender of all. And so is it with such Consciences, which are no more, nor so much moved as others in matters of undoubted Good or Evil; such as are division, disobedience, and uncharitableness, and scandal; and on the contrary, humility, and study of unity; but so sore and tender in lighter matters, that the least touch offends them, and enrages them. Which *Tully* according to his natural wit found to be most true, when he said, *Superstition was such a thing, that he who is affected with, can never be quiet*. Every thing but what he devises to himself, molests and confounds him. And out of this unsetled and unsatisfied humor, every man would very gladly have the constituting and modeling the worship of God, to prevent all superstition, but what he himself is full of: and to avoid the imaginary Idolatry of others inventions, fall into the subtle and pleasant idolizing of his own imaginations. But if way should be given to this, not only Religion, but even the world it self would soon come to an end, if we believe that wise and Learned Doctour of the Jews, *Maimonides*, writing thus: *For the judgment of man is small and weak, neither can all mortal men attain the pure truth: But if every man should yield to his own conceits, we should find the world run to destruction, through the weakness of his understanding*. There can therefore be no more deadly superstition, than for a man to fear no man but him that flatters him, and every thing but what pleases him: and to require much more clear demonstrations for the satisfaction of his pretended and superstitious fears, than possibly he can give to ground them; and so become contumacious under such colours. But to rip up this sore disease at the Core, we shall see so little Religion in the tempers of these obstinately superstitious people, that there will appear nothing of common reason, justice or ingenuity at the bottom of all: For striking into mens minds & hearts the sparks of their dividing and factious principles, as men do fire into a Tinder-box, when they have attained so much of their ends, as by the flames they raise to undo and destroy others and enlighten themselves, and become powerful and glorious, they presently cover those mischievous sparks and put them quise out, denying they teach or hold any such things; easily foreseeing they must needs have the same effect upon themselves as they had upon others, if they be suffered to blaze out, as they did when they lighted their Candles: Yet so again, that they reserved to themselves the same instruments and means of kindling new flames to their advantage, when their Interest shall so require it. This we have seen done most unjustly and disingenuously: unless therefore men could be persuaded first to be faithful and severe observers of the Rules of sincerity, and common Justice, and deliver no other Rules to their Superiors to Govern them by, than they themselves being in Power would hold reasonable to keep Religiously,

religiously themselves (which we hear indeed much professed, but ever saw practised contrarily) in vain do men endeavour to dispute men into Reason, Faith, or Truth. It must be the singular and Almighty power of Gods Grace to convince and convert them to the Truth; they being the true object of our Pity and Prayers, but not of Instructions, Perswasions, or Arguments. And what more pertinent and particular prayer ought we, or can we offer to God for their more sound information and confirmation in the truth of Gods Word and Worship, then that they object so oft and unadvisedly against us, *viz.* That God would vouchsafe to deliver them from their many private and humane inventions, and not *teach for Doctrines the Commandments of Men: nor be carried about with divers and strange Doctrines: Nor worship God so as he never commanded them, neither came it into his heart.* Alas, if they would but keep themselves faithfully and entirely to these Laws, which with so much rigour and zeal they exact from others, they must let go their hold, not of Ceremonies and orders meerly devised by themselves, but the greatest part of their Doctrines and Worship wherein they differ from us. And the time will once certainly come when we shall not on'y with confidence, but with the greatest comfort expect the full decision of these unchristian Controversies: For as St. Jude saith, *Behold the Lord cometh with ten thousand of his Saints, to execute judgment upon all, and to convince all that are ungodly among them, of all their ungodly deeds, which they have ungodlily committed, and of all their hard speeches, which ungodly sinners have spoken against them, &c.*

Matth. 15.9.  
Hebr. 13.9.  
Jer. 7.

Jude v. 14, 15.

I shall end all this with one or two instances of their Superstition and intolerable rigour, who loudly tax the Church therewith. They have often charged the Church with Idolatrous Superstition in propounding and practizing Adoration towards the East: And Voetius (who hath another dogme for the Puritans comfort, *viz.* *That preciseness can no wayes be separated from true Religion*) hath also said, *That it is a sort of Idolatry, by interpretation, for a man that prayeth in the Church to turn himself to the East, although he hath no consideration that there is, or was the Quire, wherein Papists are wont to turn to the East.* But what saith his fellow-Calvinist Maresius, who reckons up this, and another of his dogms of like nature? *Then both which assertions nothing is more absurd.* And after a little interposed, he addeth, *Neither will it be any whit less superstitious to beware of the East, at the time of prayer precisely, then precisely to make choice of it:* which was most truly spoken.

Voetius Disp.  
Part. 3. de Idolatr. Indic.  
th. 2.

*Quo utroque asserto nihil absurdius.*  
Sam. Maresius Fascicul. Paradoxorum.  
Part. 22.  
*Nec minoris erit superstitionis, &c.*

Another instance we have from the same Authour in the same Treatise, Paradox. 28. where speaking against Voetius his preciseness in pleading for hair shorn close to mens head (a fond piece of Religion, which in past years Puritans were wonderfully strict in, but have of themselves lately seen the vanity of such their practises, and laid down) he saith; *As he doth amiss, who glories in long hair; so shall not he be void of Superstition, whoever shall affirm the hair ought wholly to be taken away, or clip't above the ears, and shall therefore think himself holier than other men, that he shows the Asses ears of Midas:* and then adds very soberly, *True Godliness is strong, and being supported with the base of Christian Liberty thoroughly understood, is not pressed with such anxieties.* Well adviseth Tilenus, Part. 2. Thef. Disput. 44. Chap. 19. & 20. *That where the true knowledge and sense of this Liberty is wanting, Consciences can take no rest, there is no mean nor end of Superstitions. For Satan is wont of very toys and trifles to make dangerous and deadly snares for sou's,* Rom. 14. 5. *So he that shall begin to doubt of eating flesh, or the*

Id. Paradox. 28.  
*ut perperam faciat, &c.*

use of certain garments, by little and little shall find scruples of a murmuring Conscience in other things likewise, and at length, shall hang in suspense, in a perplexed and inextricable Labyrinth: Thus far they. The evil event of the contrary precise Superstition appearing from two or three instances given by the Parrons of Scruples. For according to former grounds, Voetius his son by his Fathers insinuations (as may well be presumed) in a publick Disputation at *Utrecht*, June 7. 1643. delivered it for unlawful to wear shooes much longer than the foot, or horn-like. And I make great doubt whether he had any better reason against that fashion than a certain noted Puritan, who seeing me, being then a young Scholar, wear such shooes, accosted me in these very words, *Why dost thou make thy foot longer than Jesus Christ hath made it?* To whom I presently answered in these words, *Why dost thou make thy hair shorter than Jesus Christ hath made it?* And in truth, I continue of this mind still, that such a reply is no idle answer to such an idle superstitious question. For if it should be demanded, why I extend Christian Liberty in the use of Ceremonies farther than Jesus Christ hath extended it, not commanding them? I would first answer, I do not extend it farther, because it is impossible for him, or any man else, to prove that Christ hath denyed this Liberty. For that which they imply that Christs command must go before all Christian Acts or Ceremonies in his Service, is quite contrary to Christian Liberty: For no Christian is left to his liberty, where such Laws or Precepts are delivered to him: But Christian Liberty is an undetermined power of doing, or not doing, within the sphere of Good and Evil prescribed: which power, next under Christ, residing in the Heads or Governours of the Church, may restrain the indifferencie of inferiour Members of it. Secondly, I would answer, by demanding, Why they shorten and straiten Christian Liberty, naturally stretching it self to the Positive, as well as the Negative part of our Religious Acts? This seems to me to be both Sacrilegious and Superstitious too. And why they make it shorter then Jesus Christ hath made it?

But I return to a second Instance of precise Superstition, by the same Author defended: *That it is unlawful to salute with a kiss a Matron at first meeting her, or departing from her, because it is the foretaste of Lust: yea, to kiss is a very ill custom: And so after the English fashion to salute all women they meet with.* Thus the superstitious Precisian; not distinguishing between a thing contrary to a sober mans Judgment, and his Conscience. Whatever is indecent or unprofitable, may be against the Judgment of a sober man, but it is not therefore against his Conscience: for only that can be said to be against Conscience which either is, or appears at least to be morally evil. Doubtless a grave and sober person may abhor the endless and witless fashions, & refuse to follow them, but not out of conscience, because they are of themselves unlawful, but because vain, useles, indecent, and perhaps incommodious, and so out of judgment, and if the consequents be apparently evil.

I shall conclude all with one instance more of the Superstition of Sectaries, the great cryers out against Superstition, taken from *Thomas Cartwright*. They commonly describe Superstition to be a rigorous exacting that at the hands of Christians, which is not necessary to be done: which is likewise to take away Christian Liberty, according to their estimation. And with this Querie they suppose they come up so close to you, as you shall not be able to deliver your self out of their hands. Is it (which you require) necessary to Salvation? If it be answered, No: then again they come upon you with another expostulation, Why then do you enjoyn it? Hath not God left us many, and those difficult Laws and Precepts, and do you make the way to heaven



ven more strait, and the yoke of Christ more heavy by multiplying Superstitious Inventions? To the latter part we have already made answer in effect, denying absolutely what is taken here for granted, that by such moderate Ceremonies, both for number and nature, as are of force and in use in our Church (fewer and clearer than any Church of Christ hath used for twelve hundred years before the Reformation lately made) the way to heaven is not at all straitened or stopped; or the Precepts of God rendred more difficult and burdensome, and not rather more light and easie to be observed, and the truly labouring Christian helped and defended by them in his rode to heaven; but where ignorant heads and evil tongues have cast infinite snares and horrible stumbling blocks in their way; and so it is not the superstitious Ceremonies, but the Enemies to such Ceremonies, which have no other Superstition in them but what they have with much study and art, and ill will (we thank them) devised, and traduced all things, not of their own invention, yet double guilt with the glorious pretexts of Gods Word and pure Spiritual Worship: which if you chance to be so profane and incredulous as to call in question and bring to the Touch, you spoil all presently. Again, farther, it is as necessary to Salvation as abstaining from notorious sins can make it, to obey those that are over us in the Lord, in all things, against which no more but general and foul language (which are solid and godly proofs with the vulgar) can be brought, nor hath been. But to come to our intended Instance. Are all things, not necessary to Salvation, not only superfluous but superstitious? What will these Objectours answer to Baptism of Infants, which, many of them, I here aim at, do hold useful indeed and profitable, but not necessary to Salvation, or to exempt from the pains of damnation, yet they are due observers of it? They say, there is a special Precept of God for the same, and therefore perhaps, though the thing be not of it self so necessary, it may become necessary, by vertue of such a Precept. Granting all this liberally, which if we would contend with them, we might put them harder to it than they will be known of: But where will they find any such direct or positive Precept that these Infants ought to be brought necessarily to Church, and be baptized in the publick Congregation? We commend their zeal, and much approve their resolution so to have Baptism administred, that, seeing one end of it is to enter, and as it were, matriculate them into Christs Visible, as well as Invisible Body, the Church assembled; they severely require this. But if nothing can be needful which is not absolutely necessary: and nothing so expedient as to be commanded by Man, which God hath not before required; who can without trembling read their horrible Superstition, who under such grievous Obligations endeavour to enforce this, as Cartwright doth in these words: *And I will farther say, that though the Infants which dye without Baptism should be assuredly damned, yet ought not the order which God hath set in his Church [Publick Baptism] be broken after this sort.* Now that the Order which he calls indeed Gods, is but the Order of the Assemblies so decreeing, is manifest from the impossibility of proving this out of Scripture, and the easiness of proving the contrary out of Reason, thus, from his own speech: For is it possible for any man to conceive that God should require any thing of any man, the observing of which should damn him? He therefore that supposes that the Infant, or any other person to be baptized, must by Gods severe command, be brought to Church to be baptized, if he be baptized at all, cannot so much as suppose that God will damn him for not being baptized at home in private: But this is here supposed by him, though, I know, not granted, that a child

Cartwright against Whitgift, page 14.

child may be damned for want of baptism, and yet this child must no where be baptized but in the solemnities of a Congregation. What is Tyranny and Superstition in the height, if this be not? What is it to advance humane Constitutions and Orders to an equality with Divine Precepts, if this be not? to suffer a poor soul to be damn'd, rather than the Orders of their Church should be broken: and to threaten and terrifie with damnation them that shall observe conscienciously the Orders of other Churches? Or how come the Orders of their Churches, which have no Scripture to confirm them (as this for instance hath not) to be more of Gods settling, than they of other Churches, no less consonant thereunto than theirs? Where is the Fear of God, Reverence and Justice, Equity, and common Ingenuity wanting to Man, if not here? Such dealings as this do really deserve our pity and prayers for them, as well as for our selves tormented by them: That God of his great mercy to them and us, would vouchsafe to open so their eyes, and affect their hearts, with such a sincere and sober fear of God, that they may like lost sheep straying into wild Desarts, and in untrodden paths, at length be reduced to the Great Shepherd of their and our souls, making one Flock, and in one Fold of the Church, to the Glory of God; the Safety of themselves, and the unspeakable joy of the Church here, and the salvation of us all hereafter.

---

F I N I S.

# ERRATA.

P Ag. 10. lin. 33. x. next for neat. p. 43. In the title of the Chapt. r. Temporalie. p. 44. l. 36. r. supposing. p. 48. l. 37. r. affectedly. p. 60. l. 38. r. vulgar use. p. 79. l. 14. dele *not*. p. 74. l. 30. dele *mere*. p. 82. l. 26. r. sure. p. 83. l. 33. r. *at*. p. 93. l. 12. r. lighter. ib. l. 51. r. people. p. 95. l. 25. add *penner*. p. 104. l. 48. r. Collatinus. p. 114. l. 12. r. *Indicemus*. p. 115. l. 6. straglers. ib. l. 7. r. assent. p. 117. l. 41. r. *we*. p. 130. l. 6. r. over. p. 136. l. 4. *point thus* ; after Political ; p. 139. l. 25. dele *be*. p. 140. l. 2. dele *of*. p. 147. l. 35. dele *not*. p. 149. l. 12. r. relaxing. p. 158. l. 44. r. there. p. 161. l. 42. r. illimitable. p. 167. l. 45. r. limitation. p. 177. l. 20. put in *us* after *have*. p. 185. l. 2. r. *is instead of being*. p. 198. l. 16. dele which sort of signs are not distant from the thing signified. p. 200. l. 4. dele *it*. p. 219. l. 29. r. *us*. p. 230. l. 14. r. leading. p. 233. l. 28. r. hold. ib. l. 43. r. ward. ib. l. 49. r. abuse. p. 234. l. 16. make ? after Church ? p. 242. l. 5. r. or. ib. l. 23. r. where. ib. l. 45. r. with. p. 243. l. 21. r. worth. p. 249. l. 2. add accordingly. p. 253. l. 31. r. Fugio. p. 265. l. 32. r. wild. p. 269. l. 9. r. good. p. 275. l. 39. r. denied. p. 281. l. 19. r. concourse. p. 296. l. 19. r. prevision. p. 309. l. 19. r. Campian. p. 321. l. 29. r. grieve. p. 333. l. 20. r. Reformed. p. 335. l. 29. r. Restriction. p. 339. l. 31. r. comminations. p. 348. l. 17. dele *of after wills*. p. 343. l. 19. add intended. p. 347. l. 3. r. immutable. p. 352. l. 19. r. Christ for And. p. 355. l. 23. dele *are*. p. 359. l. 30. r. *but where*. p. 389. l. 9. r. thou not. p. 392. l. 5. r. nothing but. p. 442. l. 40. dele *not*. p. 446. l. 20. r. unintelligible. p. 455. l. 47. dele *no*. p. 456. l. 16. r. that. p. 485. l. 30. r. should not. p. 493. l. 36. r. denied. p. 503. l. 51. r. contradiction.